The Nation

Vol. CIV NEW YORK, THURSDAY, MAY 10, 1917 No. 2706

The Week

OUT of the fine muddle over the censorship into which Congress has got two plain facts emerge. One is that there is no objection whatever to the suppression of military news that ought not to be printed. Clap on the restrictions as severely as possible, and the newspapers will neither complain nor resist. What they are now doing voluntarily—at the mere request of the Federal authorities, privately conveyed—it scarcely needs compulsion to lead them to continue to do as long as the war lasts. But the other truth has been made just as evident in the Congressional debates and the general discussion throughout the country. It is that there must be no tyrannous extinguishment of fair and honest criticism. President Wilson has manfully declared that he desires no immunity for his own official acts, and no subordinate of his can ask more than the chief. The original draft of the law deserved all the rough handling which it has received. Even the greatly modified form of the bill laid before the House was voted down; though later an amendment containing substantially the same provision was adopted. What will probably happen is a recasting of the whole matter in conference between the two houses, and the issue, we hope, will be a sensible measure of censorship. It should cover simply two points: the prevention of giving aid and comfort to the enemy, and also the prevention of giving aid and comfort to incompetent or corrupt officials at home, by shielding them from free comment or exposure.

PROTECTION of the families of merchant sailors now running such risks in transatlantic trade is a matter to which the Government may well give attention. Shipowners, making large profits on completed voyages, can afford high wages: figures quoted in the news are $1,000 a month for the captain on small merchantmen, $800 and $600 for first and second officers and engineers, $100 to $120 for sailors. But only to a partial extent are shipowners insuring the lives of officers and crew. Secretary McAdoo recommends that Congress compel all shipowners insuring their vessels with the Government War Risk Insurance Bureau to take out insurance for their men also. The powers of the Bureau would be enlarged to permit this, and policies written for sums up to $5,000 for death, with proportionate indemnity for injuries. When the Government fleet of ships is ready, it is possible that large numbers will be privately operated. Their crews will be performing as great a public service as the men enrolled in the army or navy, and there should be every inducement for them to do this indispensable work.

THE name of George Kennan need only be mentioned in order to make it obvious how eminently fitting and useful it would be if he should go to Petrograd as one of the members of the American Commission. He combines fulness of knowledge of Russia with fulness of sympathy for the cause of Russian freedom. He is one of the very few Americans of prominence who speak, read, and write the Russian language, an accomplishment by no means to be overlooked in studying the difficult psychology and the difficult problems of a foreign people in revolution. He is the one American, perhaps, whom every element in the present Russian régime would hail, not only with satisfaction, but with enthusiasm. If he should go to Petrograd, it might be given to him to meet some of the victims of the autocracy whose pitiful stories he has recorded in his epoch-making book on Siberia and the exile system. During the revolutionary movement in 1905 and the following years he was both active in this country in connection with the work of the Friends of Russian Freedom and a student of conditions on the spot. So ideal, in fact, would be the appointment of Mr. Kennan that we cannot but assume the Administration has extended the invitation to him, and it is greatly to be hoped that he is in a position to accept.

MODERATE counsels are in the ascendant at Petrograd. If the Council of Workers and Soldiers has won from the Provisional Government a disclaimer of imperialist intentions in the note sent to the Allies, the Provisional Government has won from the Council virtual recognition that all power does not rest in the delegates of the "proletariat." The talk in the Council is still bold enough. The assertion is made that if the Provisional Government is permitted to exist, it is because the Council does not consider the removal of the Cabinet expedient. But the same speaker who indulged in this proud assertion made the significant admission that the Council represents only the workers and soldiers: "We do not represent Russia." For Russia as a whole there is still the Duma, and if the announcement is true that the Duma is to be immediately reassembled, it means that the Provisional Government will be greatly strengthened. The Cabinet will then have the organized backing which it lacks at present, though the counter-demonstrations at Petrograd have shown that this support exists. Within the Council of Workers and Soldiers the moderate elements are in control. They have recognized the peril of baiting the Provisional Government; they have forbidden for the time being street oratory and demonstrations; they have requested the garrisons around Petrograd to refrain from participating in public manifestations. All this, to be sure, without abating their assertion that the foreign policy of the Government must be based on no annexations and no indemnity.

IT is easy enough to wave aside the extremists at Petrograd as hirelings or tools of the Kaiser. Such reasoning serves only the purpose of betraying a woful understanding of the Russian temper and Russian conditions. Even the activities of a Lenine, mischievous though they are and repudiated by the responsible leaders of the Russian democracy, are the logical expressions of a philosophy. To Lenine it is of less significance that German autocracy should be overthrown than that Socialism should consolidate its victory over the "bourgeoisie" in Russia; this to be followed by a similar proletarian victory in other countries, Allied

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

or hostile. It is a reckless philosophy, but it is not to be explained by the use of German gold. The moderate elements in control at Petrograd reject Lenine's method as dangerous, but they, too, think in terms of the International. They reason that by insisting on the principle of peace without annexation and indemnity, Russia will bring into being a similar demand in other countries, and they have thus much justification, that in Germany the Socialists —Scheidemann no less than Haase and Ledebour—have put forth the same demand. They would exercise pressure on the Allies to obtain a modification of the announced terms, so as to deprive the German conservatives of the argument that the Allies are bent upon the destruction of the Fatherland. Reparation for Belgium would be made an exception to the principle of no indemnity. A hint to that effect comes from the Socialist leaders at Stockholm.

FAR from showing the weakness of the German concentration against Russia, the estimate of the German army strength and distribution issued from French army headquarters shows plainly the heavy share of responsibility which Russia is bearing even in her present state of transition and uncertainty. Of a total of 219 German divisions, 143 are assigned to the west front and 73, or a little over one-half as many, to the east front—Russia, Rumania, Macedonia. Since the Rumanian front is virtually held by the Russian armies and the German strength in Macedonia is not very large, we may assume 70 German divisions concentrated against Russia. Add to this half of the Austrian army, as well as Bulgarians and Turks, and we find that in Europe alone the Russians may be facing 100 enemy divisions. In Asia, at the same time, they are opposed to the main Turkish army in Armenia and are conducting operations in Persia and northern Mesopotamia. Altogether, the Russian army would appear to be facing three-quarters of the enemy numbers confronted by the British and French armies. This is an extraordinary showing in view of Russia's incomparably inferior military resources, other than men.

CONCERNING the terribly frank-spoken attack on the German Government by Maximilian Harden, it is wise to keep certain caveats in mind. Not more importance than it deserves should be attached to it. To expect sweeping results from it immediately in German political life and German war policy would be a mistake. Harden is a free lance. He has no direct and powerful political backing. His paper, *Die Zukunft*, is a personal organ, not of wide circulation—though it has a very influential body of readers. What he writes in it is not even semi-official; and the ordinary German would give more weight to the utterances of any one of half a dozen other newspapers which might be named, and which more or less closely mirror the sentiments of the Government. Yet with all these allowances duly made, Harden's outburst must be regarded as of great significance. He has a knack of blurting out what multitudes are thinking but are afraid to say; he is peculiarly the voice of the radical intellectuals of Germany; and more than once it has proved to be the case that what Harden dares to say to-day all Germany is saying to-morrow.

THE gist of his present frontal attack on the Government is that it has been deluding itself and deceiving the people. He dwells upon the long series of ineptitudes and blunders in foreign policy since the war came. Particularly trenchant is Harden on the subject of the barbarous German submarine warfare. He boldly accuses the Government of having deliberately lied to President Wilson, and of having made bogus peace offers—all merely for the sake of gaining time to perfect its lawless weapon. And then when the inevitable result came—war with the United States and the condemnation of the entire civilized world—the fatuous Government announced that all this amounted to nothing! It is time for it now, asserts Herr Harden, to "recognize the plain truths of the situation." In stating some of these, he certainly is not lacking in audacity. Germany has been made "an eyesore to the world." The duty is to render the German house "habitable" once more. The United States, in Herr Harden's opinion, would not fight "a Germany guided by fresh men and headed for the goal indicated by President Wilson." And what that goal is, he proceeds to indicate with appalling frankness:

> Democracy is the word of the hour. A league of nations is on the way. Shall Germany freeze without, and in the era of coming peace shall militarism remain the root and branch of German political life? Responsibility for the coming peace can be borne not by any prince or any family, but only by the backs of the whole nation.

Words like these are sure to reverberate widely in Germany. Harden is much more than a voice crying in the wilderness. He furnishes the ideas which others organize to carry out. And the infection of his boldness will be certain to spread to the leaders of the Social Democrats.

THE elaborate nature of the defensive-offensive campaign against the submarine in Allied waters is revealed in a masterly little pamphlet on the subject by A. Rousseau, naval editor of the Paris *Temps*. The entire French coast from Belgium to Italy has been divided into small patrolling sectors, each with its own assigned reconnaissance forces. These comprise hydroplanes and captive balloons as well as ships of all kinds. The hydroplanes maintain a regular daily patrol. Wireless serves the double purpose of giving warning to merchant ships and coordinating the movements of the patrol boats. A method of which we have hitherto seen no mention consists in the use of submerged nets, not for the purpose of barring out the U-boats or snaring them, but for the purpose of locating them. These nets are free-floating and electrically connected with some central station, on the model of the electrically charged barb-wire employed by the British in the Boer War to give notice of the presence of an enemy. A submarine in the mere act of brushing by one of these nets records its presence at a certain spot, which is immediately besieged with ships and aeroplanes. M. Rousseau estimates that by the first of this year there were sixty miles of protective and exploratory network in French waters. He also lays stress on the development by the British of the mine-field barrage for a distance of more than 250 miles from Jutland to Flamborough Head. Hitherto, he says, the U-boats have been able to pick their way among the mines, but dispositions have now been made to prevent their breaking the line by passing either under the mines or between them.

ALMOST the last step short of Government ownership and operation of Canadian railways is recommended by the Royal Commission in its proposal that all lines ex-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cept the huge Canadian Pacific be merged and operated under five Parliamentary Trustees. Two of these roads, the Intercolonial and the Prince Edward Island, are already Government-owned; the largest part of the capital of the Canadian Northern and Grand Trunk Pacific has been either provided or guaranteed by the Government, and they are kept solvent by Government advances; and plans for additional lines, as to Hudson Bay, provide for Government ownership. If the Parliamentary Trustees "acquire the stock of the three companies, and maintain the rights of bond and debenture holders undisturbed," the Dominion will obviously be not far short of Government ownership. It seems that the Government would undertake to supply a financial deficit estimated at $12,500,000 annually on the three lines. A minority report plainly calls this virtual Government ownership, "with all its proved dangers and evils." The transportation expert, Sir Thomas Tait, recently proposed a similar scheme, though he would have entrusted the amalgamated systems to a board of nine, directing a company capitalized at the nominal sum of ten millions, the Dominion holding 51 per cent. of the stock. For both plans it can be contended that it would not be necessary to raise huge sums to purchase the lines.

PRIVATE and public interests will oppose any extensive amalgamation of Canadian lines in itself and as a long stride towards full Government title over them; but the Dominion's transportation problem is so increasingly urgent that a radical solution must be sought. Construction under public guarantees has been overdone, and there is a consequent steady drain upon the Treasury, while service is in places unsatisfactory. It is contended for amalgamation that it will make possible the utilization of shorter and cheaper routes of travel; the complete or temporary abandonment of useless lines; the freer use of locomotives and rolling stock, with resulting economy in car movements; the elimination of duplicate train service; joint stations, terminals, and offices, with reductions in staff; purchases in bulk; and the planning of new lines with public utility solely in view. The Royal Commission reports that two, not three, transcontinentals were needed, and that the Grand Trunk and Canadian Northern should have been joined. Action upon the questions now raised will put Canadian statesmanship upon its mettle.

IT is no surprise that the Imperial War Conference in London has resolved that the readjustment of the constitutional relations of the Dominions and the mother-land is too involved to be undertaken under stress of war. For such a readjustment the demand has been constantly growing, and volumes have been written upon the method of it; but full knowledge of its conditions will come only with peace. For the purposes of the war, a closer union and better coördination of effort can be effected. Thus for immediate ends the Conference calls for the establishment in London of an Imperial mineral-resources bureau, for an effort to develop in all parts of the Empire the production of war-munitions and supplies, and for the encouragement of agriculture and transportation. Preferential tariff treatment will have to be left to the close of the war; and the Conference's recommendation of such a preference will not greatly alarm those familiar with the tariff history of England and the Dominions. Perhaps most notable of the resolutions summarized by cable is that which declares for liberal treatment of India. Any reorganization of the Empire, it is affirmed, "should be based upon full recognition of the dominions as autonomous nations of an Imperial commonwealth and India as an important part thereof."

"THE opponents overworked the issue of the war." The reference is to debate on a bill in the Massachusetts Legislature to limit the working hours of women and children to fifty a week. The bill was substituted for an adverse committee report on a forty-eight-hour bill by a vote of 145 to 74. Evidently, one legislative body is not to be frightened into retreating from advanced positions on social welfare by the cry for "preparedness." Massachusetts has been among the States limiting the hours for women and children to 54, and there was not much expectation of favorable consideration for a bill reducing this number to 48. Suddenly the Committee on Social Welfare reported the bill. Its opponents rallied and managed to force a reconsideration. Then came the adverse report from the Committee, which did not satisfy the House. In its latest form, the measure provides for a nine-hour day and a Saturday half-holiday. Opposition to it has come, as usual, from the manufacturers, who are reported as having no new arguments to present, except the one referred to in the tragic pronouncement that they "overworked the issue of the war." Our military position will need to be much worse than any sober-minded person expects before it can reasonably be made the basis for attack upon legislation to conserve the strength of our people.

IT will be interesting to see whether Massachusetts has better luck with her Constitutional Convention than New York had with hers. The preliminaries in the Bay State are more propitious, since the vote upon the question of a convention was not sprung upon the voters by a political machine which hoped to profit by the trick. Massachusetts has been considering the matter for some time, like Illinois, Indiana, and several other States. Her election of delegates was preceded by rather more than the usual amount of discussion, although the only issue which came up was the initiative and referendum. Upon their attitude towards it, candidates have been termed conservative or progressive. The returns show that the voters are far from united upon the proposed change. While the "progressives" triumphed in the election of delegates-at-large, capturing 11 of the 15, the "conservatives" will be represented by 125 members to 91 for the "progressives," with 68 approved by both parties and 19 unendorsed. As advocates of a reform are reluctant to give their endorsement to candidates of whose tendencies they are doubtful, no one will be greatly surprised if most of the 68 approved by both sides are found favoring submission of the initiative and referendum to the voters. Among the delegates are such prominent men as Charles Francis Adams, ex-Gov. Walsh, Josiah Quincy, and Matthew Hale. But our ill-fated Convention showed that prominent and hard-working delegates do not insure success for the labors of such a body.

THE distinction of the late Ruth McEnery Stuart was chiefly a distinction of subject matter, though at her best her treatment showed skill in handling the materials of both humor and pathos. She perceived the rich field offered by the emancipated negro, and from "A Golden

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Wedding and Other Tales," appearing in 1893, to her "Plantation Songs" of last year, she worked it with great success. The eccentric and picturesque caught her eye in a way that has evoked protest from the negro on the ground that she exaggerated or even falsified. But she could offer sound literary reason for whatever heightening of the truth went into her picture of such characters as the Queen of Sheba, loving magnificence, determined that her funeral should be splendor itself, and allowed by a happy fate to attend that funeral; as Uncle 'Riah Washington and his medical ministerings to his neighbors; and as Salina Sue, wooed the second time. Her craftsmanship lagged behind that of which Sarah Orne Jewett and Mary E. Wilkins were at the same time showing themselves capable in the short story, but she has a place with them in the gallery of writers who have done special *genre* pictures of American life.

Emergency Powers

ALMOST every day sees a new bill laid before Congress designed to confer upon the President extraordinary powers. Scarce a province of our national life is to be left exempt from his possible control. Over agriculture, shipbuilding, railway operations, prices of the necessities, it is proposed to give him nearly unlimited sway. Viewed merely by themselves, such grants of power might seem startling. They appear greater than any mortal man could act upon. Who is sufficient for these things? But there are certain considerations which the people and Congress are clearly keeping in mind, and which render them not simply without apprehension at the lodging of such tremendous authority in the President, but heartily ready to bestow upon him every power that it may be needful for him to exert.

First of all, Congress expects to be in session but a short time. It does not want to sit all summer. Nor is there any need that it should. It was summoned ahead of time solely in order to pass the necessary war legislation. That is the reason why one bill treads so closely upon the heels of another. Much work has to be crowded into a small space. Needs must be foreseen and provided for that may arise after Congress has adjourned. If House and Senate were to be continuously at the President's elbow, each emergency might be dealt with as it presented itself. But as the case stands, it must be dealt with in advance. It would not do to leave the Executive to face a possible crisis which he could not meet effectively without having to wait until he had called Congress to come to his aid.

Another thing not to be forgotten is that all these extraordinary powers to be given the President are emergency powers. This means two things. One is that the grant is valid only for the duration of the war. It is not a question of the laws being silent in the midst of arms. The point is, rather, that Congress is asked to make it lawful for the President to do many things while the armed conflict lasts which it would never think of authorizing him to do in times of peace. It is a gift of power in order to avoid the usurpation of power. Moreover—and this is the second implication of what is being done at Washington—the immense powers placed in the hands of the President he may not find it necessary to use at all. Their mere existence may be sufficient to accomplish the purpose. Suppose any group of speculators unscrupulous enough to attempt to corner the market in foodstuffs or clothing or coal or any other prime necessity. Evidently it would be a great stimulus to their civic decency to know that the President was empowered to lay a heavy hand upon them and break up without delay their nefarious plans. Similarly with the matter of railway freights and shipyards and munitions factories and all kinds of industries making contracts with the Government. Unreasonable practices and exorbitant rates would be automatically checked by knowledge that the President might step in at any moment to commandeer or control. His possession of vast power may easily make it unnecessary for him to use it. On the other hand, if the nation needs to have him use it, there it is.

It is said—a few Congressmen are saying—that it is dangerous to pass laws enhancing the authority of the President so enormously. Some fear that we shall discover that we have created a dictator. Of course, any grant of power may be abused by any official. But no system of checks and balances, no vigilant legislative oversight, can do away with the necessity of getting officials whom we can trust, and then giving them the tools with which to do their work. There were many critics of Lincoln during the Civil War who called him a usurper and a dictator. It is true that in him the necessities of the war led to reposing a confidence and an authority before that time unparalleled. John Hay wrote privately of Lincoln as a sort of Tycoon, going his own way, seldom holding meetings of the Cabinet, running the army and navy and conducting foreign affairs according to his own will. But no one to-day would speak of Abraham Lincoln as grasping at overweening power for its own sake or to further a personal ambition. His mighty spirit was wrestling with the great work of ending the war; and that once done, he was ready to lay down every scrap of dictatorial power and be again one with the people who were bone of his bone and flesh of his flesh. And all that is sought at present by the Administration in Washington is to be full panoplied for every emergency which the war may thrust upon the country. When the emergency is overpast, the armor put on to meet it will be quietly laid away.

Gabble to "Allay Fears"

A WISE Government censorship, like charity, begins at home. Foolish talk and indiscreet publicity are bad enough in a newspaper or a private citizen, but are much worse in any man having official or even only semi-official responsibility. This truth has been forcibly brought home to Americans in the past few days. Especially has the prattle about the submarine problem having been solved by American inventors been of a sort to suggest that somebody with a big blue pencil should sit in judgment over this kind of outgiving. First we were assured with a jubilant air that the whole submarine menace had been disposed of. Certain unnamed but superhuman geniuses in this country had achieved in a few days what the best naval brains in England and France had striven for in vain for two years. But presently we learned that the wonder had not yet been actually wrought, but surely would be. And the explanation was added that the good news had been put out in order to "allay fears."

Well, we see no evidence that Americans are excessively

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

frightened. They may be excused for having one "fear"—a fear based on long experience—and this is that various governmental authorities may not know when to speak and when to keep silent. Take this two days' gabble about the submarine on the point of being put out of business. If it had been true that our naval and consulting experts had any such device in their possession, the thing to do, obviously, was to keep still about it. In case a newspaper or an individual had put about reports of such a thing, the charge would promptly have been made of giving information to the enemy. But it seems to be supposed that eminent engineers and experimenters in the service of the Government can blab about it at will. And the affair becomes monumental folly when it at once has to be stated that the announcement was wholly premature. We have not yet got the submarine panacea; we are merely hoping that we shall discover it. For "has been solved," please read "will be solved." If this is a good method of allaying fears, we should like to know what would be the best way to arouse them. Those who make sensible people tremble for the safety of their country are the men who imply that the country is not safe unless they work a miracle, which they proclaim that they are about to proceed to do!

We all with reason have unbounded faith in American ingenuity and inventive skill. It would be easy to recite a list of naval devices which the United States has given to the world. And it is not at all impossible that American resourcefulness may hit upon something new and useful in combating the submarine. But let us dismiss from our minds all thaumaturgy in the business. We are not to expect that Edison will show us how to pull a lever or press a button and explode all submarines within a radius of thirty miles. When the head of the British Admiralty tells the House of Commons that there is no "sure cure" for the submarine, and that what the navy has to do is to peg away with all the means and with all the vigilance at its command, he is probably much nearer the truth than those, new to the business, who tell us that some American inventor will soon, with a slight turn of the wrist, send every German submarine to the bottom. Even if some new and immensely valuable improvement in anti-submarine tactics or weapons has been discovered, it is not a matter for officials to chatter about. Let them do their work and get their results, and the American public can be depended upon to do all the talking necessary.

In too much of the official publicity of the past week or two there has been a woful lack of coördination as well as of good sense. First we have some one in authority put up to make our flesh creep. It is assumed that Americans will not do their patriotic duty unless they are first thoroughly scared. Then this official frightener finds that he has rather overdone it and begins to hedge. Next we rush to the other extreme and have an authorized cheerer-up turned loose. He tells us that we have got the submarines in the hollow of our hand. Or he assures us that the crop shortage is imaginary, and that we shall have more to eat and more to export than ever before. Or he points to the enormous success of the Government loan. Thus the public is expected to pass in an instant from the depth of artificial gloom to the height of simulated jubilation. Now, we much mistake the temper of the people if they find either method agreeable. They do not wish to be either made afraid or rendered over-confident by exaggerations or false pretences. They wish the truth told them as nearly as it can be, and in as few words as possible. And they desire to be informed what they ought to do. The readiness of this nation to spend and be spent in the war is unquestionable. For service and endurance of every kind the people are eager. What they desire is more information and less gossip; more instruction in what is the duty of each and all, with a great deal less of the strife of tongues.

Science and the War

DEMOCRACY can seldom achieve the unified organization which is symbolic of autocracy. In this lies its weakness as well as its strength. In times of peace, while it can scarcely rival the great strides which are the accomplishment of a thoroughly coördinated country like Germany, yet it is not so prone to go astray in any one direction. Too great progress along any one line sets up counteracting tendencies which save it from an ill-balanced development. But in war time the advantage is more dubious. At bottom, the problem before every democracy is the harmonizing of two conflicting elements—the necessary unity of purpose to carry on a successful struggle, and the encouragement and utilization of the individual initiative and knowledge which are the products of free thinking.

The mobilization of intelligence and science cannot, in the nature of things, be ordered from above in this country. The necessary organization does not exist; and if it were to be hastily created, it would provoke such antagonism as to defeat its own ends. It must be accomplished through those channels which we have — universities, technical schools, scientific societies, bureaus of commerce, professional organizations, and the like. A certain degree of overlapping and confusion is inevitable; yet the spontaneity of the effort is so marked as to justify the expectation that we may be able to rival the more perfect unity, but smaller initiative, of a more highly organized state. On every hand we see a "get-together" movement under way—an effort to ascertain what can best be done, and a hearty offering of services for the national necessity. All this must finally be coördinated as a part of a working scheme; and for this we look to the National Council of Defence, with its ramifications of sub-committees.

What are these various bodies doing? First of all, taking a census. Columbia, Stevens, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and many others have listed their graduates, not only for their availability, but for their particular qualifications. Many are already engaged in the various departments of Government work. Our agricultural schools, especially Cornell, Amherst, and Rutgers, are distributing their students far and wide, as overseers of city farms, organizers for new enterprises, advisers to groups of large farmers, seed-testers, and State-employed travelling teachers. The sudden demand for expert knowledge has put a strain on them which they have met with success. But the greatest immediate test is being borne by the medical profession. Some doctors are already mobilized in the Reserve Corps; but the greater part of the work is being done through the medical schools and hospitals. Through them, units are being organized for active service; and the response is so great that there is fear of a depletion at home. Moreover, the work of the students is being speeded up. It is reported that both Harvard and Columbia will continue through the summer and grant final degrees in the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

autumn. The National Chamber of Commerce, through its referendum, is doing notable service in concentrating the thought and opinions of the business community on problems of the war, and presenting them to Congress in condensed form.

Columbia University is demonstrating in a practical way the utility of professors during war time. It is issuing a series of pamphlets dealing with important aspects of public policy in a concise and skilful way. They are not merely expository, but are at pains to point out a desirable programme for each subject. They cover a variety of topics. "Food Preparedness," by Professors Seager and Chaddock, points out the present position of the country, as nearly as it can be ascertained, in regard to the present deficiency. "City Gardens," by Professor Parsons, gives practical instruction for the use of small city plots. Professor MacElwee discusses the possibilities and difficulties of agricultural mobilization. Professor Anderson takes up the influences of price regulation. But perhaps the most valuable is the advice of Professors Seligman and Haig, who undertake the construction of an equitable policy of war finance. Its carefully balanced conclusions may well be recommended to the extremists on both sides who are demanding legislation too much in conformity with their own interests or emotions. It is the duty of legislators to consider the opinions of our scientists. Their inclusion on Government councils would go a long way towards insuring for the country the adoption of wise policies.

Immigration and the Labor Supply

TO speak of the new Immigration law as having gone "into effect" May 1 is to speak loosely; for nowadays there is scarcely a tithe of the one-time human materials upon which it can take effect. It will be really effective only when the war ends—perhaps only when its aftermath is gone. In the years immediately preceding the European war an annual average of one and a fifth million aliens came to America—1,214,480 in 1914. The conflict at once cut off most of this volume and comparatively accelerated a return stream of Europeans repatriating themselves. Thus in the year ending June 30, 1915, some 435,000 immigrants sought the United States, and some 385,000 aliens went home, leaving a balance here of 50,000. In the year ending June 30, 1916, less than 370,000 immigrants arrived and 240,000 aliens returned, leaving a balance of 130,000. Lately less than ten thousand immigrants a month were arriving at New York, the principal entry. In considering what will be the effects of this law, with its excellent provisions strengthening the medical demands as to the bodily and "constitutional psychopathic" health of immigrants and its unwise provision that all immigrants above sixteen must be able to read some language, we cannot dissociate it from the war's own effects upon immigration. Congress debated it in the light of before-the-war; we must consider it in that of after-the-war conditions.

Opponents of the law have always contended, as did Taft and Wilson, that the literacy test is simply a quantitative restriction. Many defenders frankly avowed this, and the popular sentiment behind the bill was almost wholly one for a quantitative restriction on South European immigration. How great this restriction would be is not known, but some estimates put it high; for in the years 1899-1909 the self-admitted percentage of illiteracy among immigrants was 26.7. It is evident that a reduction of what immigration the war leaves us by one-fourth, or even much less, may be very unfortunate. Already the country demands labor urgently in many sections, and there is ground for believing that the months following the war may leave the demand still great and still unsatisfied. The war is remaking Europe socially, and in many respects it will leave lands like Russia and Austria-Hungary much more desirable for the lower classes. Land-division schemes are being formulated there and throughout Europe, and multitudes of large estates will be broken up, by Government action or the bankruptcy of great holders, and distributed under plans for returning soldiers to the land. States organized to mobilize industry in every field may in many instances take steps to retain able-bodied men to fill the places of the millions killed or incapacitated, even by forbidding emigration by law. And Commissioner Howe tells us that "reports from steamship and railway companies indicate that large numbers of men [in America] are planning to return to Europe after the war. The estimates, based upon investigation, run as high as a million men. Poles and Hungarians are imbued with the idea that land will be cheap in Europe, and that the savings they have accumulated in this country can be used for the purchase of small holdings in their native country." It is true that another view holds that high taxes, fear of future wars, and faith in the richness of America will bring multitudes to this country.

Within the past two years two millions of unemployed in America have been absorbed, and wages have risen fast. The average day's pay of an unskilled laborer before the war has been put at from $1.65 to $1.75, and it is said that it now varies from $2.25 to $3. Iron and steel workers who used to receive $2 or less, now, thanks to several 10 per cent. increases, receive $2.50 or more. But the labor shortage is beginning to hamper American industry in many fields, and is crippling it in some. Gen. Coxey is reported as complaining that, though he offers "the lowest kind of labor $3 a day and cakes" at his Ohio quarry, he cannot keep the men! The farmer, in the Middle West especially, can hardly fulfil the nation's expectations of him without an increase in the labor supply for which there is no apparent source. The importation of "peons" from across the Southwestern border, in response to the wage demand, has been unwelcome to many; and the South is protesting against the great exodus of negroes to Northern industrial centres. If industrial conditions remain good after the war, if immigration remains poor, and emigration from America takes place on a large scale, the labor problem may be progressively acute.

Plainly, the literacy test will now shut out some thousands of workers whom the country needs. The country is in the position of rushing into a restrictive policy when that policy is most uncertain and dangerous. The argument is clearer than ever that if restriction is to be decided upon, it ought to be a flexible form of restriction. A suggestion has been made for a standing immigration commission empowered to lift and lower bars according to the visible labor needs, empowered to discriminate between certain kinds of labor as required by this country, and empowered to direct labor to the sections where it is in demand; and huge as are the problems involved, it deserves consideration.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The New Mexican Constitution

WITH the accession of Venustiano Carranza to the Presidency of Mexico, after due election, the organic law defining his powers and providing for the whole system of Mexican government becomes of special interest. The new Constitution, framed by the Convention at Querétaro, is, judged by American standards, a portentously long document. Even the Oklahoma Constitution, which, we believe, holds the record for length in this country, is far surpassed in number of words by the Mexican Constitution. And the reason at once leaps to the eye of one reading it. For what it attempts is not merely to block out a plan of government—to present a skeleton afterwards to be clothed with flesh and blood by executory legislation—but to draw up an entire legal and social programme. Probably nothing so ambitious and sweeping was ever undertaken in any written Constitution. Many things are admirable, some are highly questionable, and the whole is undeniably open to the charge that it represents rather a great scheme of social renovation than a workable plan of government.

Our own Federal Constitution has at the end a sort of Bill of Rights, in the shape of the first Amendments adopted. This is placed by the Mexican Constitution at the beginning. The very first chapter has to do with the "Rights of Man." These are set forth in 29 Articles, covering a tremendous range of subjects. They embrace individual privileges and the rights and duties of corporations. Many of the general provisions are excellent. They are level with the best practice of the most advanced nations. On paper, at least, citizens in Mexico have guaranteed to them every personal right and judicial safeguard that they are entitled to demand. They cannot be imprisoned for debt. They are assured of speedy justice in the courts. Their property cannot be taken from them except by due process of law. They have freedom of the press, of public assembly, and in "the expression of ideas." The early French models of the rights of man are faithfully followed.

The question has been asked whether there is freedom of religion in Mexico. The Constitutional provision is: "Congress shall not enact any law establishing or forbidding any religion whatever." Yes, but are there not in the Mexican Constitution a great number of minute provisions interfering with the free exercise of religious rights? Undoubtedly there are. Yet, except in one or two particulars, they do not go beyond the previously existing laws. Long ago all church property in Mexico was "nationalized." Religious bodies can hold and utilize only such property as is assigned to them by the Government. The sharp provisions against ecclesiastics and religious corporations did not originate with Carranza. They date back sixty and seventy years, to the legislation of Lerdo de Tejada and Benito Juarez. By so much, they represent the settled policy of Mexico. The new Constitution does contain one novel stipulation, which has already been made the subject of protest. It is that "only a Mexican by birth may be a minister of any religious creed in Mexico." The aim of this is obvious: it is intended to shut out foreign priests who in times past have made political mischief in Mexico. But it would, of course, apply equally to Protestant missionaries.

In the matter of governmental machinery, the new Mexican Constitution follows in general the previous organic law, which in turn was an adaptation of the Constitution of the United States. There is the same division of powers; though a tendency of later days is seen in the provision that the President and also State Legislatures in Mexico have "the right to originate legislation" in Congress. But it is in the section relating to "Labor and Social Welfare" that the new Constitution makes the most radical departures. Here we have the eight-hour day, the minimum-wage and profit-sharing, especially the breaking up of great land holdings and their distribution among municipalities and individuals. Very modern sounding provisions regarding strikes and lockouts, workingmen's insurance, and labor bureaus are incorporated. This entire part of the Mexican Constitution reads as if it had been written by a body of social reformers. Whether the whole properly belongs in a Constitution is fairly open to debate; but it cannot well be denied that it embodies many of the ideas animating the Mexican revolution, which began by expelling Diaz, and which now finds hope of fruition in the coming of Carranza to the Presidency.

Those Who Were Not Rescued

THIS is the experience of a family of a region of France which was invaded by the German army in 1914 and now, after two and a half years of German occupation, has been won back by the French. It is the family of my concierge and his wife, who are here in a Paris suburb. They grew up in neighboring villages of the Somme and there each still had a mother, brothers and sisters, and some of these had grown-up children. The villages were beyond the range of the battle of the Somme, about thirteen miles from Péronne and four or five miles from the famous château-prison of Ham, which the Germans blew up as they were leaving. In fact, this family experience is of German occupation and evacuation of French territory rather than of soldiers killed and wounded. It has been none the less trying to flesh and blood.

The child of my concierge, an infant girl, was staying for country air with one of her grandmothers when the war rumors began. Luckily, she was brought back by a friend in one of the last trains. From that time, during many months, nothing was heard from those who had remained in their homes behind the German lines.

Then a letter came from the concierge's brother, dated at a prison camp in the far interior of Germany. He had been carried off with others of the civil population—he was too old for military service—in the first days of war. He was a bachelor and had been living alone with his mother, who is in the eighties. He could only say that the mother was still living in her little house and that a horse, aged like herself, had been left her. He asked that packages of provisions be sent him through the Red Cross of Switzerland; and they have been sent regularly for more than a year. After several months more, a French doctor, who had been exchanged from the same prison camp, came to give news of his fellow-prisoner. So the months passed, but there was no news of the mothers and brothers and sisters and their families left in their own homes behind the wall of German troops.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

After a year and a half a cousin of the concierge's wife, who had been employed as a cook for German officers at Noyon in the banker's house which they had appropriated and where she was at service when they marched in, was exchanged through Switzerland for some German woman interned in France. Noyon is only ten miles or so distant from the villages where the old people lived, but the German authorities allowed no communication. Of the concierge's mother this refugee knew nothing. She had heard that the wife's mother was suffering greatly from a cancer —that was all and it was not consoling.

The months passed again and then, one morning, I heard weeping and wailing in my concierge's lodge. Through another exchanged prisoner, they had learned that the poor old woman was dead. Whether she had died alone or whether some of the family had been able to remain with her could not be known.

This may seem strange, for her son and his wife, and their son and two daughters, all grown up, were living in the neighboring town of Nesle. The mother had lived with her own two daughters, one a widow without children and the other unmarried, in the neighboring village. And now, since the Germans have been driven out, it is learned that she died with only strangers to close her eyes.

First the son at Nesle and his own grown-up son were deported into Germany to work, no one knows where, for no news has come of them. Then the son's two daughters at Nesle, one twenty-three and the other nineteen and both unmarried, had orders, in their turn, to pack up their little baggage and be deported along with 150 young women of the town. The distracted mother forced her way to the German commander and represented that she had paid her toll of flesh and blood, that her husband and son had been taken already. For whatever reason it may have been, the officer in command crossed off the names of the daughters. It must be said—and American mothers ought to hear it before they cry for peace—that the people of the region, from experience, say of such girls whom the German officers leave behind them: "They cannot be pretty or they must have something the matter with them."

Meanwhile, the poor old woman with her cancer was living with her two daughters in their out-of-the-way village, when these too were put on the list for deportation and actually carried off. And they are still behind the German lines, no one knows where. They were approaching middle age, but were able-bodied and useful for Germany that needs labor. This is the excuse which the *Schwabische Mercur* has given for such deportations. Therefore the old woman, with seven of the family she has brought up within call, must die alone with her cancer.

So far for the family of the wife of my concierge—that is, so far as heard from. Any and every anxiety is reasonable for those who have been deported. Let us return to the mother of the concierge—who had been left alone with her horse, aged like herself, since the beginning of the war. Nothing could ever be learned of her existence, except that a man, who had been exchanged from a neighboring town, came to tell her son he had seen her working in her little patch of ground. He could not, by the rules of the German authorities, go near enough to speak with her, for he did not live in her commune.

Now that the French have taken back all this part of the invaded country, the mayor has made it his first duty to reassure families in suspense. He has written to my concierge: "Your mother is living and well, but very much aged. She has been brought into Nesle, with the other inhabitants of the neighboring villages and farms."

It is too soon yet to allow anxious relatives to go to see for themselves how their suffering ones have fared. Not buildings alone, but trees and the very roads have been destroyed; and the military authorities have their hands full erecting shelters and getting food and clothing for an entire population whose least resources have been wasted or carried off by the retreating invader. My concierge hopes his mother's house may have been spared, although he knows she is no longer in it. It stood a little way off from the high road.

These are very humble families, but they say "Father!" and "Mother!" I do not see why their fate and its useless cruelty should not edify the world, even though the rule may or may not be the same for evil and for good: *Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these.*

Paris, April 17 STODDARD DEWEY

The Guide of Reason

WE are well accustomed nowadays to the voices of those who, in these times of international turmoil, ever and again urge us to leap to action—to action in accord with the impulses most prominent in mind at the moment, even where we dimly realize the abysmal darkness that confronts us ere we leap. We are familiar too with the derision of those of the common herd who find us hesitant on the brink; and with the disdain of those of broader culture who ask us to see in ourselves men who are "sicklied o'er with the pale cast of thought."

Our intellectual sensibility, if we may so speak, is thus dulled; but even so one cannot but be aroused when one hears, as I did the other day, a thoughtful and influential professor of law saying, "As the result of mature deliberation, I have come to believe that instinct is a safer guide to conduct than reason." Caught by this phrase, I jotted it down; and when, in the interest of accuracy, I read it aloud to the speaker, in the presence of the little company assembled, he asked permission to amend it, as he disliked the elusive word "instinct"; and finally put it as follows: "As the result of my mature deliberation I have come to believe that reason is the least trustworthy guide to conduct; or, better still, the least trustworthy guide in matters of conduct is *conscious* reasoning."

Teachings of this nature coming from the lips of an influential guide of youth cannot but be listened to with attention, especially as they are often heard from others less careful of their words. And as the matter they refer to has great interest for many intelligent men and women, who not infrequently find themselves sympathetically acquiescent with statements such as I have quoted, it seems worth while to consider in some little detail the meaning and import of the position thus maintained.

If, in the first place, we take the trouble to look a little below the surface, we perceive that the attitude exemplified in statements of this kind results from the ebullition of a deep-lying force that tells in the development of modern philosophical systems so diverse as pragmatism, in certain of its forms, and the intuitionalism of the author of "Creative Evolution"; a force which we perceive to be identical with, but less bold than, that which generated the "Roman-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tic Movement"; and which, when unmasked, looks suspiciously like a somewhat shamefaced recrudescence of that mode of thought which is associated in our minds with the teachings of Rousseau.

When we look still deeper, our attention is attracted to the fact that our speaker acknowledged that his conclusion had been reached "as the result of mature deliberation." Now "mature deliberation" in general is necessarily a process of thought; and in this case it is one in the course of which the thinker consciously examined the supposed results following upon subservience to various guides to conduct, and intelligently and rationally evaluated them. Thus he here enunciates a principle which he would have us employ as a guide to conduct; yet in reaching this guide he places explicit trust in that very *conscious reasoning* which he contends is "the least trustworthy guide in matters of conduct."

Many of those who are ready to subscribe to the general position here considered do not reach it as the result of what they would call "mature deliberation," and may scarcely be aware that it has been reached by processes that involve rational efficiency. But the mere sense of conviction involves an implicit and momentarily "conscious" judgment; and judgment is a process of reason.

If it seems somewhat startling to find so clear-cut a case of self-stultification, exemplified in the words of a man of keen insight like our professor of law, we are led to see nevertheless that he is carried away by a current that has engulfed many another. For has not even Bergson tricked himself in the same manner? In his subordination of intellect to intuition he surely has employed intellectual means to devise and sharpen an intellectual tool, with which he in the end aims to commit intellectual suicide. And this current is one that, with irresistible power, sweeps from their moorings the careless and thoughtless. Bewildered and hesitant, they find a delightful relief from strain in "letting themselves go," at the same time comforting themselves with the assurance that their intellectual superiors tell them they are thus choosing the better way.

We cannot remain satisfied, however, with demonstrations of logical inconsistencies where we deal with opinions that are common to thoughtless and thoughtful alike; rather must we assume that their acceptance is based upon more or less obscure grounds which are so influential that even those who are given to "mature deliberation" are led to overlook the logical slips made in their statements of the basis of their convictions. We perceive that any such conviction has become fixed quite apart from the reasons given to account for its maintenance; for a little thought serves to remind us that a large proportion of statements similar in form to that above quoted are made because of a desire to give an appearance of rationality to courses of action that have been adopted quite apart from "mature deliberation." If, then, we are to get at the truth of the matter before us, we must look for the conditions that have led to the conviction itself.

Where such conditions are not the mere results of the imitative acceptance of dogmas held by those who forcefully influence our lives, they are usually due to the careless acceptance of the first means that suggests itself as adequate to remove a disconcerting sense of perplexity. In the case before us, we watch the activities of men in their efforts to adapt themselves to the conditions of life. We see the majority reacting without forethought, and apparently, on the whole, reacting effectively. We see the minority, who deliberate, often after hesitancy reacting ineffectively; and this is so disconcerting and unsatisfactory that we are led to take the position here considered in order to avoid our perplexity.

But why are we disconcerted when we find rationally guided conduct ineffective? Surely it is because we have come to believe that action after deliberation ought to be effective. We expect it to be effective, and are disappointed. And how does it happen that we have come to hold that action after deliberation ought to be effective? Surely no such expectation could be entertained unless it were based upon actual experience that tells in its favor; unless, in other words, it were true that rationally guided action appeals to us as on the whole effective rather than ineffective.

This leads us to suspect that the failures of effectiveness noted in connection with deliberative action impress us so forcibly that we overlook the more frequently experienced but less emphatic cases, where deliberation results in effective action; and we are thus led to ask whether we are justified in our further assumption that immediate reactions without forethought are generally effective. Do we not pass over too lightly many cases where such non-rational action is altogether ineffective? Is it true, in other words, that on the whole the man who "lets himself go" in reacting without forethought is likely to prove the more effective man? Would it be agreed, for instance, that he who yields to every intense sexual impulse is a more effective man than he who stops to consider the possible results of his indulgences, and who guides his sexual conduct by "conscious reasoning"? I think not.

Those who defend the position here criticised forget that the non-deliberative actions are what they are because of inheritance, or acquired habit, which determine their immediacy; that they thus speak of the experience of the past, in the race or in the individual; that they are non-hesitant, and consequently non-deliberative, merely because they have been effective in that past; and that they are effective in the present only so far as the conditions now met are approximately the same as those experienced by our ancestors or ourselves in that past. They also forget that hesitation would not appear, and deliberation would not be suggested, were not the conditions now met relatively new.

Argument is not required to show that a more perfect adaptation to new conditions is of the essence of human advance. Nor do we need to note that such adaptation involves that hesitancy in reaction which is the accompaniment of deliberate attempt to guide the direction of reaction by rational methods. When one holds, therefore, that, on the whole, the majority who react without forethought react effectively, one really means that the majority of reactions are without attempt looking to the adjustment to new conditions necessary to man's advance. But when one steps beyond this and holds that "the least trustworthy guide in matters of conduct is conscious reasoning," one is in reality holding that, on the whole, no such adjustment to new conditions is worth while. Or, in other words, one teaches that all efforts to advance towards perfection are pure and unadulterated folly; a doctrine that the most perplexed of us will scarcely be prepared to accept without very serious questioning, and one that the serious student must promptly reject.

HENRY RUTGERS MARSHALL

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Society of Independent Artists

THE new Society of Independent Artists has set for itself the ideal of an open exhibition entirely without standards. Each exhibitor pays six dollars for the right to show two pictures. So far as conditions permit, the arrangement is severely alphabetical. The hanging committee expressly announces that no taste has been exercised in the installation, and the walls confirm the statement. Everybody has come in. In the more than a thousand contributors there are professional artists of every stamp, amateurs, children, and jokers willing to pay six dollars for their joke. Oil paintings, monotypes, photographs, monochrome drawings, and aquarelles, with an occasional etching, make the show the most miscellaneous possible. It is not dull, it is even amusing in a restless way, one impression rapidly effaces its predecessor, and the visitor is likely to leave mildly exhilarated by a gentle confusion of sensations and rapidly fading memories.

The movement is based on the belief that the artist should have the chance to exhibit on reasonable terms unrestricted by juries and unpampered by prizes. Similarly, the public should have its chance to see and judge practically everything that is being done, without being deceived or misled by middlemen—whether academic, critical, or commercial. The ideal would be a big coöperative picture bazaar, open to all comers and managed solely in their interest. I think there is room and need for this kind of exhibition. A similar independent salon has served a useful purpose at Paris for a generation or more. It is, however, a somewhat tragic waiver of the true relation that should exist between artist and art lover that both in Paris and in New York pictures should have to be marketed like "unlisted securities" on the curb. Yet, if modern conditions make exhibition essential to the artist—and to the young artist it surely is—then there is much sense in opposing to all manner of costly or exclusive mediation so democratic and accessible a method of exhibition and sale as has been worked out by President William J. Glackens and his associates.

What is chiefly notable about the exhibition is the unmistakable evidence of the progress of the various new movements. At least two-thirds of the contributors are deeply tinged with Post-Impressionism, Cubism, Futurism, or other -isms too numerous to particularize. Post-Impressionism is simply the cult of immediacy in mood and of simplicity and blare of color. It is merely the last stage of Romanticism, but unlike the old Romanticism, of Delacroix, for example, it has completely cut loose from European culture. The artist consults merely his own soul, and in most cases has a poor consultant. The technically alluring side of the programme is syncopation, emphasis, and purity of color. This quest has enlisted considerable talents who were trained in the realistic and impressionist schools. Here Putnam Brinley, George Bellows, Reynolds Beal, Reuterdahl, Perrine, and Allen Tucker are typical names. Unquestionably they have gained what they sought, to wit, freshness—possibly at some sacrifice of more valuable qualities of thought and reflection. Dearth, the ablest exponent of this compromise, is not represented. While certain talents thrive well enough on the programme of immediacy, others shipwreck. Marin and Maurer, both delicate talents, seem to me to have disintegrated in the endeavor for concentration.

Where Post-Impressionism seems to be working towards something is in the field of decoration. Here Gardner Hale's delightfully wholesome Baigneuse is the capital exhibit. It is a blend of the primitive Italian manner with accessories caught from Japanese screen painting, a very joyous and successful synthesis, an ideal decoration for a garden house. Of similar intention are the scurrying nudes in Samuel Weiss's A June Shower. More akin to the older Impressionism is a vivid and substantial nude called Pippa, by Christina Morton. Rockwell Kent is another realist drawn into the new ways. His two contributions have notable beauties of color with a symbolism impressive if overstrained and incomplete. Eugene Higgins, only tolerably represented on the walls, is perhaps the ablest exponent of the new emotional immediacy. He has the advantage of being steadied by the example of Daumier and of remoter old masters. The Dancer, by Charles Demuth, is the most consistent expression of the *genre*. It gets the orgiastic effect it seeks, at the complete sacrifice of restraint and taste. The whole criticism of the movement depends on whether such qualities as taste and restraint are still valid in the art of painting. Of this by no means unimportant issue the reader shall be judge.

Post-Impressionism is in direct descent from the older Romanticism. Its exaggeration of concentration is already implicit in the drawing of Daumier, Puvis, and Rodin. Cubism and Futurism are brand-new inventions, and so is Synchronism. These movements are very fully represented by works of Picasso, Gleizes, Metzinger, Picabia, Severini, Max Weber, and Arthur Dove, not to mention the latest prophet, Macdonald Wright. The geniality which is so marked in Post-Impressionism is absent from this work. Instead we have the most pedantically calculated eccentricity. As art the result seems to me quite negligible. Sometimes these geometrists get something. I find Walter Pach's bit of cubist symbolism called Sunday Night very soothing and fascinating, without having the least idea what it's all about. It looks like a smoothly working machine under iridescent illumination, is rather hypnotizing. Yet I much doubt if the new narcosis is worth the old perception. What confirms the doubt is the unwonted splendor assumed by stray competent examples of academic sort on the walls. A Bruce Crane landscape gets the worth of a Poussin, Sergeant Kendall's bathing nymph Sabrina gains from its setting the dignified warmth of a Titian. A portrait by Charles Hawthorne imposes itself like a Raphael. Such transvaluations make me feel that the balance of importance is still with the traditional manner.

The same conclusions may be drawn from the best of the newcomers. H. Koniatzki's characterful portrait of his wife, Mr. Wickwire's excellent likeness of himself, a little head by Abraham Harriton gain from their setting an old-masterly impressiveness. Moreover, the barbaric movement seems to be giving place to miscellaneous sorts of romanticism and symbolism. Often these are ingenious and able, as in Bertram Hartman's Two Natures, or in Charles Holloway's Nature (as tropically sensuous as a Gustave Moreau), or in André Derain's Greco-like Head of a Woman. But if the new century is to inaugurate only a subjective Romanticism, then we have merely got back to the conditions of 1830, with the marked difference that the first Romantic artists partook broadly of the best culture of the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Renaissance, whereas the new Romantics drink casually from many and mostly inferior cups.

The organizers of the exhibition deserve credit for carrying out their democratic programme with complete loyalty. It is an advantage to show things as they are, if only that we may the more readily learn how they ought to be. If the present demonstration of crude and untutored individualisms leads us back to the springs of great art, it will have served a most useful end. All great art is grounded in some sort of humanism. To regain that last vantage point is the urgent problem of the art of painting to-day, lurching as it is into all sorts of small eccentricities. The noble traditionalism of Mrs. Harry Payne Whitney's memorial to the heroic men who went down with the Titanic dominates and in a manner rebukes its company. It fittingly commemorates certain standards of beautiful action that transcend the unrest of the individual and recall values that are those of the race. It will have to be reckoned with long after the amateurs of novelty and exploiters of small individualisms shall have been well forgotten.

FRANK JEWETT MATHER, JR.

A Good Old-Fashioned Controversy

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The reviewer of Professor Harper's "Wordsworth," in your issue of April 19, offers your readers several curious bits of historical misinformation, especially concerning the history of political doctrines. It is perhaps worth while to call attention to these errors.

(1.) "The writings of the American Federalists . . . were a reply to the loud clamors . . . of men impregnated with the anarchical Godwinian individualism." Since the *Federalist*, to which the context shows that your reviewer is referring, appeared in 1787-8, and Godwin's "Political Justice" in 1793, the former can scarcely have been directed against the influence of the latter. Nor can it be said that the authors of the *Federalist* were attacking Godwinians before Godwin. There were, of course, those in America who feared the dangers to "liberty" (by which they did *not* mean what your reviewer seems to suppose) which would result from giving extensive powers to the central government, and especially to the executive; but it is as unhistorical to identify this attitude with the later philosophical anarchism of Godwin as it would be to say that Hamilton was a man impregnated with the autocratic political teaching of Treitschke.

(2.) "The writings of the Federalists represent a vigorous reaction against the fear of government expressed by Mill, Bentham, and Godwin." Mill, it may be incidentally remarked, was born some twenty years after the publication of the *Federalist* and wrote nothing until after the Federalist party was dead. But, anachronisms aside, what strange bedfellows we have here! Bentham, so far from sharing Godwin's anarchism, detested all such doctrines and has been recognized by the historians of political theory as one of the first to look upon legislation, "not as an exceptional instrument of policy," but as a positive and constantly operative agency for the improvement of society. "Bentham's capital discovery in political science," as Sir Frederick Pollock put it, "is that the duty of the sovereign is to make laws." Is this what your reviewer understands by a "fear of government"?

(3.) The idea "that the sole function of government is to secure liberty of action to the individual" is "perfectly patent and explicit in J. S. Mill." It would be of interest to students of political theory if your reviewer would indicate the passage in which Mill patently and explicitly expresses this idea. It is wholly at variance with the doctrine of his "Representative Government"; and his celebrated essay "On Liberty" may be said rather to express the view that the principal function of government is to impose certain limited but very necessary restrictions upon the liberty of action of the individual.

(4.) Throughout his references to political subjects, your reviewer, by implication or explicitly, groups Rousseau, Godwin, Bentham, and Mill together, as representatives of "individualism" in political theory, and sets the authors of the *Federalist* in opposition to all of these, as opponents of that tendency. This falsifies the positions of all of the writers mentioned, except Godwin. The Federalists, in spite of their belief in a strong government and their aversion from pure democracy, accepted as the basis of their political creed the essentially individualistic doctrine of natural rights. To Bentham, and to Mill after him, this doctrine was an "anarchical fallacy" only less objectionable than the full-fledged anarchism of Godwin. While Rousseau helped to give further vogue to the already current ideas of natural rights and the social compact, what is really characteristic of his political teaching—as all recent competent students of him have united in pointing out—is his insistence upon the supremacy of the *volonté générale* and upon the almost unlimited subjection of the individual citizen to the state. As the latest and best editor of his political writings, Mr. Vaughan, has said: Rousseau was the first "to attack individualism in its stronghold, as a speculative theory of Right."

(5.) Professor Harper "meets the theory of 'natural goodness' in Rousseau's 'Émile'" and "comes upon the same thing in Schiller's 'Anmuth und Würde.'" But it is by no means the same conception which is to be found in these two writings. Schiller, in a passage of the essay referred to, is elaborating the conception of the *schöne Seele*, which Wordsworth later versifies in two stanzas in the "Ode to Duty"; but the German writer expressly declares that this ideal moral being, in whom duty and inclination invariably coincide, is not merely exceptional but non-existent. Rousseau, on the contrary, maintained the doctrine of the natural goodness of all men when uncorrupted by society.

ARTHUR O. LOVEJOY

Baltimore, April 24

THE REVIEWER'S REPLY

Before replying in detail to Professor Lovejoy's letter, the reviewer would like to ask him as a student of logic whether the two sentences following express substantially the same idea: (1.) The man was hanged for murder and chicken-stealing. (2.) The man was hanged for chicken-stealing. If he concedes that in the second sentence just a *nuance* of meaning present in the first sentence has been omitted, perhaps he will not object to a slight modification of the passage quoted in the first paragraph of his exceptions.

(1.) What the reviewer said was: "The writings of the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Federalists were a reply to the loud clamors of *radical democrats and* men impregnated with the anarchical Godwinian individualism" (the italics indicate the *nuance* of meaning omitted by Professor Lovejoy). The reviewer did not say that the writings of the Federalists were directed against the "influence" of Godwin's "Political Justice"; nor was he at this point or elsewhere in the dark about the dates of the men and books discussed. The reviewer designated as "anarchical Godwinian individualism" a certain powerful stream of political thinking which runs throughout the eighteenth century and conspicuously widens its course between the American Revolution and the Revolution in France. Does Professor Lovejoy consider Godwin the sole source and fountain of anarchical individualism? The fact is that Godwin only carries to its logical conclusion the profound individualistic tendency in his master Rousseau and the profound individualistic tendency in his friend and predecessor Tom Paine. Why did radical democrats and philosophical anarchists in the eighteenth century, why do they in the twentieth century, flock together? Because they stand in the relation of parents and offspring; because a philosophical anarchist is a man who has "seen through" the consequences of radical democracy. The Federalists also saw through radical democracy, and provided against the anarchy latent in it. "Their conservatism," says the Encyclopædia Britannica (article on Federalist Party), "became increasingly a reactionary fear of democracy; indeed, it is not a strained construction of the times to regard the entire Federalist period from the American point of view as reactionary—a reaction against the doctrines of natural rights, individualism, and states' rights and the financial looseness of the period of the War of Independence and the succeeding years of the Confederation."

After the publication of "Political Justice," writers on the Federalist side assailed its doctrines as continuations and developments of the dangerous tendencies which they had discovered in Rousseau, Paine, and the Jeffersonians. Thomas Green Fessenden ("Christopher Caustic") in his "Democracy Unveiled" (published at Boston in 1804; second edition, 1805) lumps democrats ("Democratic Republicans") and anarchists together as foes to good government and social order, and he finds Jefferson guilty of "the full effulgence of Godwinism" for his advice to Congress in a letter reported on by the Board of Treasury in 1787. Let us have Christopher Caustic's characterization of Rousseau:

> There was a gaunt Genevan priest,
> Mad as our Methodists at least,
> Much learning had, but no pretence
> To wisdom or to common sense.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> E'en took it in his crazy noddle
> A *savage* was *perfection's* model;
> And nature without cultivation,
> The *ne plus ultra* of creation.
>
> Anticipated, happy dealings,
> When mankind, *rul'd* by *social feelings*,
> Would be perfected, *sans* a flaw,
> Without the *Tyranny of Law.*

In a footnote to "rul'd by social feelings" the author says: "See Rousseau's Emilius, Godwin's Political Justice, and other writings of the canting philosophists of the same school." After some notice of French and German tributaries to the stream of political, religious, and moral free-thought, the satirist continues as follows:

> And, reader, I affirm to thee,
> A Democrat, Illuminee,
> Though noted each by different name,
> Are in reality the same.
>
> They each object to the propriety
> Of *law* and *order* in society;
> Think reason will supply restraints,
> And make mankind a set of saints.
>
> Their leading tenets tally nicely,
> And are, I think, the same, precisely,
> Unfolded by that fish of odd fin,
> The Jacobinic William Godwin.

These passages are not quoted for their critical value, but for their illumination of the *historical* alignment, in which Professor Lovejoy is so much interested.

(2.) "The fear of government expressed by Mill, Bentham, and Godwin." If the reviewer had added Tolstoi to this list, as Professor Harper does, would Professor Lovejoy still have scented an "anachronism"? Would he still have thought it necessary to point out that Tolstoi was born some forty years after the publication of the *Federalist?* A moderately attentive reading might have convinced him that these men were mentioned in the review as in the quoted passage from the book merely as representatives at various periods of a similar concern for the freedom of the individual. As for the "strange bedfellows," not the reviewer but Professor Harper made the bed! Furthermore, he put the authors of the *Federalist* into it also. The reviewer in horror extracted the Federalists from it. If Professor Lovejoy wants to pull Bentham out, let him take the matter up with Professor Harper. Nevertheless, the reviewer will venture the opinion that after the removal of the Federalists the three remaining worthies will sleep not too uncomfortably together—Mill beside his acknowledged master Bentham, with Godwin on the other side. Picking up the first recent book at hand, Ernest Barker's "Political Thought in England," the reviewer finds this comment on the creed proceeding from Adam Smith and Bentham: "That creed had been a corrosive solvent of everything that clogged the free play of individual liberty. . . . It had condemned governmental interference in the name alike of economic and political liberty." Of such a creed one may fairly say, it expresses a fear of government. Since Professor Lovejoy has a partiality for the authority of Sir Frederick Pollock, let us hear also from him: "It must not be overlooked that the tradition of Bentham and political utilitarianism contributed something to the minimizing view of the state's function. For law, being viewed exclusively as command and restraint, came to be thought of as in its nature an evil; and of course it followed that there ought to be as little of it as compatible with the preservation of society" ("History of the Science of Politics," pp. 121-2, London, 1906). As for Bentham's "capital discovery," making laws is perhaps as neutral and harmless an occupation as a sovereign can engage in; executing them is another matter. Furthermore, the restraint of liberty implied by legislation depends somewhat on the nature of the laws. Laws, for example, abolishing capital punishment or imprisonment for debt or censorship of the press are not precisely abridgments of liberty.

(3.) In Mill's "On Liberty": "The object of this essay is

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to assert one very simple principle, as entitled to govern absolutely the dealings of society with the individual in the way of compulsion and control, whether the means used be physical force in the form of legal penalties or the moral coercion of public opinion. That principle is that the sole end for which mankind are warranted, individually or collectively, in interfering with the liberty of action of any of their number is self-protection. That the only purpose for which power can be rightfully exercised over any member of a civilized community, against his will, is to prevent harm to others. His own good, either physical or moral, is not sufficient warrant." If this is not radical individualism, pray what is individualism?

(4.) The writings of Rousseau, Godwin, Bentham, and Mill abound in inconsistencies and contradictions, to be explained partly—especially in the case of Rousseau—by an irreconcilable conflict between reason and temperamental impulse. Students of these men emphasize at one time one element of their influence; at another time another element. Professor Harper, for instance, says: "The political views of Rousseau, as stated, for example, in 'The Social Contract,' are extremely individualistic." The reviewer himself collected some years ago all the principal evidence to show Rousseau's insistence upon the subjection of the individual to the will of the majority. The evidence is extensive, yet not extensive enough to overthrow Rousseau's well-established reputation as the greatest individualist on record. "Recent students," according to a curious natural law which governs these matters, tend to unite, if possible, in differing from their predecessors, even at the risk of being stunningly paradoxical. To deny that Rousseau, Godwin, Bentham, and Mill have been powerful contributors to the main stream of political individualism is a stunning paradox and stridently "unhistorical." At this rate, we shall presently hear that the opponents of these men—say, Johnson, Burke, Carlyle, and Arnold—were of the radical individualistic left wing. Professor Lovejoy comes so near to taking that position that he tempts one to reply in Johnsonian style: "Sir, if you take that position, I'll not talk with you."

As for Hamilton's belief in natural rights, the Encyclopædia Britannica says (article on Hamilton): "In his earliest pamphlets (1774-1775) he started out with the ordinary pre-Revolutionary Whig doctrine of natural rights and liberty; but the first experience of semi-anarchic states' rights and individualism ended his fervor for ideas so essentially alien to his practical, logical mind, and they have no place in his later writings."

If the doctrine of "natural rights" is, as Professor Lovejoy maintains, "essentially individualistic," what does he make of Rousseau's assertion of them?

If Bentham and Mill discard "natural rights," it is because they have got something "just as good," as the shopkeepers say, namely, abstract and theoretical rights, more or less logically deduced from the grand utilitarian principle—the greatest happiness of the greatest number. As a matter of fact, Mill's reasoning about liberty and equality rests upon an assumed "normal" condition of human beings which is as purely hypothetical as Rousseau's "state of nature," and which practically amounts to the same thing.

The reviewer suspects that Professor Lovejoy has been more or less misled by the penchant exhibited by Rousseau and Bentham for *legislating*. The matter is too complex for satisfactory discussion here; but one may perhaps light a candle by which the relation between legislating and individualism may be profitably examined. Most college professors—excepting deans and presidents—are, it will be generally admitted, individualists! Some of them closely approximate the "Godwinian anarchist," who is significantly companionable with the Socialist. What each one of this temper actually demands is free play for his own individuality. What each one fears is authority centralized in the office of the dean or the president. What each one professes to desire is to subject his individual will to the *volonté générale* discoverable in a meeting of the faculty. What is likely to happen in a numerous faculty inspired with a belief in pure democracy is endless palaver, in the midst of which, perhaps, *some prominent rationalizing individualist or "anarchist" comes forward with an elaborate and impractical legislative programme* for curbing the powers of the "autocrat" and permitting the individual to do as he pleases. What the friends of good government foresee as the result of the proposed distribution of power is not so much a "tyranny of the majority" as a tyranny of the leaders of the majority, tempered by a disposition on the part of the sturdier individualists to disregard the majority vote and to be a law unto themselves. The results are various. If the individualists have a fair taste of the labors of legislating and administering their laws, there may be a strong reaction, caused by fatigue and the perplexities of anarchy, in favor of a strong, stable, centralized power outside their number, or in favor of the delegation of most of their affairs to a small group of their representatives.

(5.) Professor Harper, to whom Professor Lovejoy had suggested what the former calls "a possible connection" between Schiller's passage and Wordsworth's ode, does not mention Schiller's disbelief in the existence of "the Beautiful Soul." For this omission Professor Lovejoy must complain to Professor Harper. But the point is of no relevance whatever so far as the review and the reviewer are concerned. The German conception, as Professor Harper presents it, is that "certain souls, through natural innocence, were secure from temptation, and needed not for their guidance the precepts of moral law." It is this conception that Professor Harper says has no basis but "pure sentimentality." Rousseau's fundamental principle in "Émile," again as Professor Harper presents it, is "the incontestable maxim that Nature's first impulses are always right, and there is no original perversity in the human heart." It is this conception that Professar Harper says is "sincere," "reasonable," "noble." The reviewer fails to see how a belief that *some* men are naturally good can be "pure sentimentality" while a belief that *all* men are naturally good is "sincere," "reasonable," and "noble." This again is a question of logic.

In conclusion, may the reviewer suggest that Professor Lovejoy's letter would have been somewhat clearer if he had carefully divided it into two parts headed respectively: Attack on Professor Harper, and Attack on the Reviewer? In that case each might have explained his "curious bits of historical misinformation" separately. If an apology is required for references to the Encyclopædia Britannica instead of the original sources, the reviewer can only plead that he is not wholly a man of leisure, and that the explosion of paradoxes is rather his recreation than his vocation.

THE REVIEWER

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS

Elliot's Herbert Spencer

Herbert Spencer. By Hugh Elliot. Edited by Basil Williams. New York: Henry Holt & Company. $2 net.

IT befell the reviewer of this volume, now brought out in the Makers of the Nineteenth Century series, to take it up for the first time late at night, and to be rendered utterly inattentive to the progress of the clock while reading the opening chapters on Spencer's Life and Character; for Mr. Elliot has struck off a remarkable sketch of a unique personality. An interval ensuing, a return full of anticipation resulted in a painful reversal of feeling. The chapters on Spencer's philosophy and works are as distinctly mediocre as the earlier chapters are extraordinary. The last mentioned are fit to rank high among the best efforts at the portrayal of personality, while the former are no more than a faithful résumé disfigured by incompetent and futile criticism.

Let us first be done with the disappointing part of the book, that we may fix attention on its excellences. Mr. Elliot tells what is in the several volumes of the "Synthetic Philosophy" and the other works of Spencer. There is some gain, perhaps, in doing this, though it is hard to see who is to profit much by it. Collins's Epitome of the "Synthetic Philosophy" has certainly, within its field, rendered such a digest rather superfluous. And Mr. Elliot's comments, though he makes a brave show of differing from his master, and emphasizes the fact that he is a true Spencerian in so doing, are casual, repetitious, and incommensurate with the sweep of the original. We are repeatedly told that Spencer ignored the psychological in favor of the logical, that his metaphysical performance is full of errors, and so on. "What is meant by the Unknowable? Already, in specifying its existence, knowledge of it is predicated." A good many of us have heard Spencer picked to pieces in this pseudo-profound fashion in our college days; and have imagined the slaughter, had such Liliputian assaults been made on the real thinker *in propria persona.*

The chief service of this latter part of the book is in illustrating, from Spencer's writings, salient personal characteristics brought out in the first chapters. For all in all, Spencer was a queer chap; and the fact that he was also an undoubted genius magnifies his queerness into something really grandiose. He was fussy, vain, and self-centred, devoid of much human feeling; he seems to have had "listerine instead of blood"; he was self-consciously and even grotesquely miserable; he was truly pathetic in his latter days. But he was also fearless, absolutely honest and sincere, and really rose above all his own smallnesses to an heroic stature. You do not feel that you could have liked him (as you would have liked Darwin or Huxley), but you feel the presence of a rugged character and, above all, of a mighty intellect. You do not wonder that Darwin and Huxley felt small beside Spencer, however much they distrusted his conclusions. His mind was a powerful, smoothly running machine, emanating force, yet demanding, to all appearance, almost no fuel. It adapted itself to any subject that aroused its interest with ease and precision. It must have been the despair of any data-assembling inductive scientist.

For—and here is the key to its action, and also the explanation of its essential weakness—the mind of Spencer did not lend itself to induction at all. Spencer admitted that he was an idler; Mr. Elliot doubts whether he ever read any book, except a novel, through from cover to cover. He did not study. His mind prowled about over the field of facts, picking up this and that and storing it away automatically. These pickings were then forgotten. Presently, however, a big principle hove in sight and was seized upon; and promptly the assorted facts rushed from their several mental pigeon-holes, like iron-filings to a magnet, and formed about an *a priori* premise the illusion of induction. When the process was going on, Spencer resented the presentation of destructive instances (which, apparently, his own mind was not wont to suggest to him), and hastily got out his ear-tabs, actual or metaphorical, and clapped them on. Witness Huxley's joke about Spencer's idea of a tragedy being the puncturing of a grand theory by a refractory fact.

This is the strongest beam of light that Elliot throws upon Spencer's mental processes. "The appearance of induction is only an appearance"; "Spencer formed his theories *first,* and established them by induction *afterwards"; "*the marvel is that his immature opinions should so very rarely have failed to be supported and established by subsequent induction"; "the fact remains that so long as his theory required the assistance of a spurious factor [*e. g.,* the inheritance of acquired characters], so long did he consider that factor quite adequate to support it." "The truth is that Spencer had the makings of a fanatic, and herein lie both his strength and his weakness." These quotations speak for themselves. The only large-scale piece of induction in Spencer is the "Principles of Sociology," where, in default of information, it had to be sought; and there are those who believe that these "Principles" will live long after the rest of Spencer's work has passed away. The writer knows of no work on sociology that disputes, as yet, the supremacy of the "Principles," begun forty-odd years ago and completed in 1896.

Among a number of other points cleared up by Mr. Elliot, one may be selected for mention. During his lifetime, Spencer hinted that, after his death, there would be published an autobiography that was an autobiography. Interested people ordered a copy and awaited the revelation. It was an immense anti-climax that they were treated to, as every one knows. But now, says Elliot, this was due to the fact that the aged Spencer, unable to keep a powerful mind employed—for he could do no real work after midday if he was to sleep at night—allowed it to focus itself day after day upon the happenings of a not too dramatic career. And the result was an elaboration of the minute and often trivial. The old man's restricted interests seemed to him of an importance inappreciable by the world at large; hence the dull and often fatuous detail set forth with unimpressive impressiveness.

Says Elliot, summing up Spencer's achievements:

> We shall find that, without money, without special education, without health, he produced eighteen large volumes of philosophy and science of many diverse kinds; that he invented an entire new system of philosophy which for half a century filled the attention of all thinking people; that he led the chief controversies on Evolution and Biology without ever having received any tuition in those subjects; that he wrote perhaps the most important textbook of Psychology of his century, without any acquaintance with the works of his predecessors, and scarcely

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

any with those of his contemporaries; that he established the science of Sociology in England; that in all branches of so-called Moral Science he was recognized as a leader; that he became the philosophic exponent of nineteenth-century Liberalism; that he published a variety of mechanical inventions; that on endless other subjects, great and small, he set forth a profusion of new and original ideas. A stable judgment will recognize in those achievements a true greatness, that may withstand all passing gusts of popular opinion.

The Middle West

The Mississippi Valley in British Politics. A Study of the Trade, Land Speculation, and Experiments in Imperialism Culminating in the American Revolution. By Clarence Walworth Alvord. With maps. Two volumes. Cleveland: The Arthur H. Clark Company. $10 net.

PROFESSOR ALVORD has been for many years the master pioneer of Middle Western history, and has either himself collected and written, or encouraged others to collect and write, documents and monographs placing the early phases of that history for the first time upon the sound foundation of historical scholarship. In the volumes before us he presents the results of many years of research and makes clear the goal towards which all his investigations have been tending. He proposes to deal with the Middle West as something more than a land of frontier prowess and settlement or of personal heroism and Indian warfare; he wishes to give it a place in the larger world of British expansion and to discover its influence in shaping the relations between Great Britain and her colonies in the years before the Revolution. Thus he is taking his stand with those who would study American colonial history as a phase of European history, realizing that the day is past when colonial history can be viewed solely as an American interest. He deals with the unsettled West as a British possession, just as other scholars are dealing with the older colonies as British possessions, and he is determined to find out how far the acquisition of this territory in 1763 influenced politics at home and how far home policies influenced the administration of this territory before the year 1774.

In following out his plan, Professor Alvord finds himself viewing American history of the pre-Revolutionary period from a new angle and making, as he believes, a new and important discovery. This discovery is to the effect that the policy which was the real concern of the British Ministries between 1763 and 1774 was not that shaped by Stamp act riots, non-importation measures, constitutional claims, the Boston Massacre, the Tea controversy, and the general notion as to the proper dependence of a colony, but the policy that arose out of the problem of the West, what to do with it, how to organize it, what attitude to assume towards Indians and settlers, and how to distribute garrisons for its protection. That, as Professor Alvord sees it, was the only real American issue, so far as the British political leaders were concerned, and that, he thinks, was the only important American question which they discussed and the only American difficulty which effected political and Ministerial changes in England. All the others, the customary stock in trade of the historian, he deems minor in character, secondary in importance, and in a way accidental results of the attempts which were made to solve the one vital problem—the problem of the West.

Hence, if we are to judge from his preface, which contains his statement of faith, Professor Alvord believes that what he has written is an adequate explanation of the American Revolution, and is certain to disturb the peace of the older and more orthodox historians who will resent his omission of the usual familiar features. He sees himself hurling defiance into the older camp, and braces himself to meet the counter-attack when it shall come. On this point we hasten to set his mind at rest. We doubt if any one reading these volumes, with the preface and title omitted, would discover anything either defiant or rash in what is here presented or would anticipate any seismic convulsion resulting from the conclusions reached. The reader will find that Professor Alvord has opened up a very interesting and important phase of British policy, which has certainly been largely ignored hitherto, and has done his best to give it form and body; that he has treated his subject with extraordinary thoroughness and insight, and has fortified his statements with an array of references to documents in print and manuscript that show a wide casting of nets, and of nets with a very fine mesh. He will find his attention called to the important place that the western problem did occupy in the minds of British statesmen, and he will read some very illuminating chapters on what was taking place in America also, looking to the occupation and settlement of the territory between the Alleghanies and the Mississippi. And he will realize that Professor Alvord has performed a great service to the cause of American history, a service deserving the thanks and appreciation of every student interested in the history of this country.

He will find, furthermore, that Professor Alvord is right, in the main, in saying that in the ultimate analysis it was the western problem that was responsible for the American Revolution, and for this reason. Mercantilism, which concerned chiefly colonial trade and involved the question of the dependence and subordination of a colony, particularly in all that had to do with the commercial relations with England, would not in itself have brought on revolt. The cause of the American Revolution was not British mercantilism, but British imperialism, as developed after 1763 and after the decision had been reached to retain Canada and give up Guadeloupe. Now the main concern of imperialism was the new western territory, not the old colonies, but as it happened this issue carried in its train a host of consequences, which, unexpected though they were, became major issues because they raised the whole question of the place of a colony in the imperial scheme. The western issue led to the passage of the Stamp act and the Townshend act; these acts in their turn roused the patriotic and radical elements in America to assert what they called their constitutional rights; this assertion, having no foundation either in law or in history, stirred deep resentment in England, because it denied what most Englishmen believed to be the immutable position of a colony in its relation to the mother country, and the immutable law of colonial relationship was as real to the average Englishman as was the immutable law of human nature to the American radical. This resentment was in large part responsible for the retention of the duty on tea, and with the retention of the duty on tea the fat was in the fire. Professor Alvord says nothing about any of these things, and if he believes that it is unnecessary to say anything about these things in order to narrate the causes

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

culminating in the Revolution he is following a false lead. He has discussed in great detail the earliest of the issues to which imperialism gave rise, but he has failed to realize that sleeping issues, when aroused, can easily become major issues, and that a relatively minor matter, such as was the problem of the West, can sometimes raise a very large question, such as that of colonial dependence, which was after all the crux of the whole situation.

Furthermore, in his detailed and searching attempt to discover a true imperial policy formulated by British statesmen, Professor Alvord has shown with unmistakable clearness that there was no such policy. Three or four different programmes were framed, but no one of them was adopted and consistently carried out, and except in the case of Hillsborough, the so-called western problem had little or no influence on British changes of ministry or the fortunes of party leaders. Despite his admirable characterizations of the various ministers and factions, he has not advanced our knowledge very far beyond what was already known in general terms. Administrations were unstable, statesmanship second-rate, and office a matter of log-rolling and bargaining. The level of British leadership is about where it was before, though in individual instances, such as that of Shelburne, the standard is unquestionably raised. In following the long and involved analysis of personal opinion and party manipulation, often uninteresting and difficult to understand, with its tangle of ministerial sentiment and factional quarrelling, we wonder whether so much detail was necessary for Professor Alvord's purpose. Too much consideration seems to be given to personal influence and too little to the traditions of offices and departments, and throughout the work there is lacking something that may be called the atmosphere of British officialdom, with its veneration of precedent and adherence to routine. In a number of instances phases of policy are ascribed to individuals which are undoubtedly the outcome of debate at one board or another, or the handiwork of lesser officials and under-secretaries.

All that Professor Alvord has here written of the actual attempts to settle the western territory, of land-schemes and land-grants, of the activities of promoters, and of the migrations of restless wanderers and pioneers is of the greatest interest and value. Nothing in the volumes is better than the account given of Samuel Wharton and his efforts in England to obtain a land grant from the Government. Some ghosts are laid, as in the case of Daniel Boone, "whom fickle tradition has chosen to apotheosize as the prototype of western State-makers of all generations," but who was only a pioneer and hunter and never a state-maker in any sense of the word. But as for any connection between the political mind at Whitehall and the actual business of settlement in western America there is scarcely a trace, and we follow, generally in alternate chapters, two movements, one in Westminster, shifting, indeterminate, and purposeless, the other in America, restless, aggressive, and land-hungry, between which there are no important bonds of relationship.

If the fact be recognized that in this work we are dealing with only one aspect of a great and difficult problem, and are not to look on what it contains as a study of causes culminating in the American Revolution, then we can freely accord to it the praise that it justly deserves. In some respects it is a great work, but if we are to judge from Professor Alvord's preface and title it is not all that he thinks it is. We believe that in the final determination of causes other issues will be found influencing the attitude of British Ministers and Parliament more even than that which concerned the western lands. The problem of the West was new, but that which involved the status of a colony was a century old, and, while the Western issue brought the larger colonial issue into unexpected and sharp relief, it was the latter and not the former that became the final cause leading to revolution.

Four American Novels of Quality

The Madness of May. By Meredith Nicholson. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Peter Sanders, Retired. By Gordon Hall Gerould. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

The Light in the Clearing. By Irving Bacheller. Indianapolis: The Bobbs Merrill Co.

Aurora the Magnificent. By Gertrude Hall. New York: The Century Co.

TO current American novels of more than common merit which have been recently hailed in these columns, four may be added. They are not at all alike, but each is excellent in its kind. Mr. Nicholson's fantasy is a trifle of delicious quality—a confection, if you will, of the purest and soundest materials. If we have seemed to harp upon this writer's function as a maker of joy and to deplore as relatively mediocre his efforts to play the part of sober and responsible commentator, here is a bit of justification. Contrast it with Mr. Nicholson's latest novel of serious intent, "The Proof of the Pudding." There we had a conscientious and too well-labored study of certain unimpeachable American manners and types—relieved by a single portrait. The action, attempting "truth to life," failed to achieve reality, in place of the glamour that had been, as it were, consciously eschewed. For Mr. Nicholson has a glamour, and needs only let himself go to convey it. He has strong in him that pleasant madness which the characters in this little book seem to have rescued from the bailiwick of fancy and turned loose upon the public highway. That, to be sure, has been a fashionable adventure in recent years. Mr. Chesterton has loved the word madness more well than wisely, and has overdone the business of proving that the thing it stands for is the only genuine sanity going. But the trouble with Mr. Chesterton is that the habit of extravagance, of verbal or practical paradox, has "got" him. He must be always at it for its own sake, with the result that Chestertonian fantasy has its unfailing suggestion of wires and contraptions. Mr. Nicholson, on the other hand, gets an effect of free and unforced play, of Pan-like ease and surcease from the dull regulations of convention and common-sense. The whimsy of his present escapade is subtly compounded by the attribution of a tale called "The Madness of May" to one of his persons—a book of light-hearted extravagance that affects all its readers with a spirit of childlike enjoyment, and so brings about the action. Its ingenious and sufficiently plausible "plot" appears to develop instead of being built to order: all nonsense if you like, but nonsense with a touch of divinity—a gust of pure romantic delight blowing for an instant across the dingy path of everyday.

Mr. Gerould's central situation is full of whimsical possi-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bilities. He succeeds in developing them without forcing or exaggeration. Grateful, for one thing, is his quietly modulated voice, so free from current tricks of the story-telling trade—a little humdrum, even, but carrying well and holding the ear without need of periodic recapture by assault. Not quite the sort of style for this sort of story, one begins by thinking, and ends by crediting it with a large share in the tale's effectiveness. The problem is that of a famous New York gambler, forcibly retired and exiled by the zeal of a reforming District Attorney: what shall he do with himself; what, in all senses, is to become of him? Peter Sanders at sixty is neither a bad man nor a dull one. He has "run" the most exclusive and decent gambling establishment in America. The business has interested him, he has made it profitable without violation of any of the gambler's rules of honor. And he has put his leisure and much of his money into a private collection of books which, within its range, has no rival in the country. He reads books, moreover, and has made up (or more than made up, as he eventually suspects) for his lack of college training by scraping an acquaintance with antiquity that leads to real intimacy with a certain group of Roman authors. He is not without resources, therefore; but his banishment from New York (prescribed as an alternative to Sing Sing) involves separation from his books and his few friends. With him upon the eastbound steamer, to be sure, goes as his valet his long-time butler, the man Henry—a type of devoted British servitor by no means matchless in recent fiction, with the coldest of exteriors and the warmest of hearts and a total lack of humor. His master's turn for the sardonic and the allusive is a continual mystery to him, without affecting his devotion. It is he who nurses Peter Sanders, like a billiard-ball, from promising corner to corner of Europe, in the hope of finding somewhere away from New York a place in which the master may dwell in peace and content. But there is no such place, and the homesick exile presently returns to America under an assumed name. Association, here and there, with the kindly, respectable, average American citizen oddly moves and influences him. He begins to feel that the odium of his old profession was not undeserved and quite gives up his thought of reverting to it when opportunity permits. He does not go undiscovered or altogether unpunished; but, with a sturdy few, Peter Sanders, the quiet, friendly, generous companion, has established himself beyond recall. After a time he is permitted to return to New York, and in the end settles down as a manufacturer of folding perambulators, and *persona non ingrata*, at least, to society in one sense and another. The story (which is not, we suspect, without its foundation in fact) is in its way a romance, and long before we are done with him we have formed a proper romantic affection for its stout and aging hero.

The author of "Eben Holden" is undisguisedly a writer of sentiment. "The Light in the Clearing" takes us, yet again, upon a sentimental journey, in a very good sense of the term, into the past. "A Tale of the North Country in the Time of Silas Wright" is the sub-title; this may be called an historical novel, with Wright acknowledged as the hero in a larger way. Frankly, in his eloquent Preface, Mr. Bacheller owns his wish to portray a very great figure in American history who has been in danger of being forgotten by the nation as a whole. "One self-contained, Homeric figure, of the remote country-side where I was born, had the true Spirit of Democracy and shed its light abroad in the Senate of the United States and the Capitol at Albany. He carried the candle of the Lord. It led him to a height of self-forgetfulness achieved by only two others—Washington and Lincoln." Wright chose to serve the people in his own way, without regard to honors. He might have had Cabinet appointments under two Presidents, he might have been nominated and would then have been elected to the Presidency in 1844, he might have had a place upon the Supreme Bench: that he refused all these high places has in itself endangered his memory. Mr. Bacheller's story may well succeed in restoring him, for the time at least, to the public mind: the more probably because, instead of trundling us through the stages of his hero's political career, he has been wise enough to let us look upon him as he appeared among his own people, back in that "north country" of New York State which had bred him and always remained his real home. The story proper has to do with the fortunes of the supposed chronicler, a protégé of Wright's. Bart Baynes is an orphan, adopted by an uncle and an aunt, bachelor and spinster, who live "on Rattle-road in a neighborhood called Liketysplit." It is a household of small cash, no manners, and much stiffly hidden love. While he is still an urchin, a wandering prophetess, the "Silent Woman" of the countryside, predicts for the boy a stormy but successful future in terms which we are to see fulfilled as the tale unfolds. Here, indeed, are all the elements which go to the compounding of rural melodrama, including that *deus ex machina*, the local Gradgrind, who holds everybody in his toils until the right hour strikes for his confounding. But Mr. Bacheller has shown how even these ancient materials may still be employed with dignity and effectiveness. He renews once more the deathless illusion that inheres in all such conventions, and thereby proves his virtue as a story-teller. Bart Baynes is a fine fellow—youth triumphant over self and over circumstance, a worthy disciple of his master and exemplar, the great and unspoiled Silas Wright. Mr. Bacheller has the knack of making one's throat swell with simple, homefelt emotion for the Golden Rule and other tritenesses which, for the most part, we are ready enough to abandon to the movies, literary and other.

The most striking book of our four, the story of greatest originality and force, seems to us to be Miss Hall's "Aurora the Magnificent." The book hangs upon the central characterization. If we did not believe in Aurora, the whole performance would be well-nigh farcical. But we do believe in her, preposterous as she is, and we cannot be happy until we leave her happy with her strange mate. We even believe in the permanency of that happiness. Miss Hall passed her girlhood in Florence and is upon her own ground in making it the scene of the present comedy. She takes that well-beloved scene, with its old-world stateliness and charm, its treasures of atmosphere and of art, sets down in it an American girl of no breeding and great strength of character, and gives them meaning for each other. The Mrs. Aurora Hawthorne who invades Europe with her wealth and her mirth has undeniably a "past," with which she is to be confronted in due season. Her real name is Helen Goodwin; she is daughter of a Cape Cod pilot; has become a nurse, married a rascal of divers names, come into a legacy from a later patient which has involved her in legal nastiness, and escaped with an old playmate, also under her old play-name, to Europe and luxury and freedom. Her

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

benefactor has been wont to sing the praises of Florence, and thither, by that chance, she turns. Florence mystifies without abashing her. She takes a great newish palace, decorates and furnishes it according to her impossible taste, and sets herself with the highest spirits to "having a good time." She makes her way, in her way: she is extravagantly generous, unpretentious, a great child playing, and winning others, in spite of themselves, to share her play. Only one person discerns that she has suffered and is still capable of suffering. This is a youngish artist, Gerald Fane, of American birth and Florentine breeding, a supersensitive person with a broken heart and frayed nerves. Aurora's tastelessness and frequent buffoonery are torment to him, but he cannot help responding to her genuineness and inherent goodness. In short, despite all barriers, they need each other and find each other; and so thoroughly have we come to trust the essential sympathy and sportsmanship of them both that we have no fears for their united future. The main thing, and the overwhelming thing, is our faith in Aurora's greatness as a woman, in her adequacy for life, upon whatever terms it may challenge her. The wench among gentlefolk is a favorite figure with the romancers: at the moment, in "The Road to Understanding," one of the most popular of American slush-compounders has just shown her deserving her man by reforming her speech and manners, "becoming a lady." Our Aurora's triumph over us and her Gerald is that we exult in her as she is.

Notes

MAY announcements of the Century Company include, besides those already made, "The Derelict, and Other Stories," by Phyllis Bottome, and "The Home and Its Management," by Mabel Hyde Kittredge.

Henry Holt & Company announce for publication on May 17 "Poems of Earth's Meaning," by Richard Burton; "Flame and the Shadow Eater," by Henrietta Weaver, and "Workmanship of Shakespeare," by Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch.

The following volumes will be issued this month by the J. B. Lippincott Company: "The Life of Robert Hare," by Edgar F. Smith; "Church Advertising," by W. B. Ashley; "Rural Schools from Within," by M. C. Kirkpatrick; "Technique of Pictorial Photography," by Paul L. Anderson; "A Handbook of English Literature," by Edwin L. Miller; "Productive Plant Husbandry," by K. C. Davis; "State Board Questions and Answers for Nurses," by John Foote, and "Our Flag and Its Message," by Major J. A. Moss and Major M. B. Stewart.

May publications of D. Appleton & Company are announced as follows: "The Dark Star," by Robert W. Chambers; "Keeping Up with Your Motor Car" and "The Home Handy Book," by A. Frederick Collins; "McAllister's Grove," by Marion Hill; "Enchantment," by E. Temple Thurston; "First Aid for Boys," by Norman B. Cole and Clayton H. Ernst, and "Ballads the Whole World Sings," edited by Albert H. Wier.

The following volumes are announced as forthcoming by E. P. Dutton & Company: "Where Runs the River," by Henrietta Leslie; "Four Feet on a Fender," by Edward Leigh Pell; "Form and Function," by E. S. Russell, and a translation into English blank verse by William Ellery Leonard of Lucretius's "Of the Nature of Things."

APPEAL for assistance for the family of a gallant and distinguished French scholar, who gave his life for his country, is made by an influential committee of French and American scholars, of which Mr. Berthold Laufer, of the Field Museum of Natural History, Chicago, is the American Secretary. Dr. Robert Gauthiot, Directeur d'Etudes adjoint in the Ecole des Hautes Etudes, one of the most brilliant Oriental scholars of our time, died in Paris on September 11, 1916, at the age of forty, from the effect of a wound received as a captain of infantry while gallantly leading his company to a grand attack. Dr. Gauthiot has made lasting contributions to Iranian and Indo-European philology, and was at the head of a scholarly expedition in the Pamir in July, 1914, when news of the outbreak of war induced him to return to France to take his part in the defence of his country. He distinguished himself by his bravery and received the Croix de Guerre. He leaves in very straitened circumstances a widow and four daughters, the youngest of whom is three years of age. The Gauthiot Memorial Fund has been formed for the maintenance of the destitute family and for the publication of a Gauthiot Memorial Volume. Contributions, which will be gratefully acknowledged, may be sent to the American Secretary or directly by draft on Paris to Prof. A. Meillet, 65 rue d' Alésia, Paris XIVe., France, Treasurer of the French Board of Trustees for the Gauthiot Memorial Fund.

THE historian of the future cannot have too much material of the sort which Everett P. Wheeler has included in his "Sixty Years of American Life" (Dutton; $2.50 net). As to the motives and acts of our conspicuous national figures during the past three generations we have on record no lack of information, but here is the autobiography of a citizen who never served in any high office, or fathered a new cult, or even set his own immediate community agog with his achievements. Mr. Wheeler has lived these sixty years as a plain citizen, but a highly useful one. He set his hand to the promotion of many good causes, both public and private, and saw at close range some of the most important political movements of his time. And he tells the story modestly, with a spirit of fairness to all concerned, and in a style that does not fail to hold the reader's attention. A considerable part of the book is devoted to the struggle for better government in New York city during the long period from 1854 to 1910. The author was on the firing line in all the successive reform campaigns which marked the last quarter of the nineteenth century, often close to the leaders and always a valiant worker. His narration of these struggles is straightforward; there is no attempt to cloak mismanagement and failure with specious excuses, nor on the other hand to claim an undue share of the glory when glory there happened to be. An inspiring book it is in every way, breathing through its five hundred pages an unshaken loyalty to the principles of democratic government, yet demonstrating how much one man can do, through inconspicuous channels, towards making that scheme of government measure up to its ideals.

CHINA and her friends are to-day thinking and believing hard things of Japan, and are anxious that we should be on our guard against what they consider the Machiavellian policy of the island empire. One of the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

self-constituted champions of China, the American editor of the *Far Eastern Review* of Shanghai, Mr. George Bronson Rea, recently issued a pamphlet in which he imputed the most bellicose attitude to the leading men in Japan. Shanghai is a hotbed of anti-Japanese sentiment, and residents of its foreign settlement are not likely to hear, nor to indulge in, much calm or critical treatment of the international situation in the Far East. The very wording of the title of Mr. Rea's pamphlet ("Japan's Real Attitude Toward America: A Reply to Mr. George Bronson Rea's 'Japan's Place in the Sun—the Menace to America'"; edited by Toyokichi Iyenaga; Putnam) betrays a certain twist. It is borrowed from the phraseology of European publicists who deal with the aspiration of Germany to expand northwest to the British Channel and southeast to Bagdad and the Persian Gulf. The analogy would suit fairly well if confined to Japan in Asia, with Korea already absorbed, and Kiaochau, for the present at least, in her clutches. But Mr. Rea's attack is easily turned when he depicts Japan as eager for an aggressive war with an empire thousands of miles distant, for many years her closest and best friend, and bound to her to-day by vital common interests. The various articles which make up Dr. Iyenaga's book vary in value and propriety. Some of them show excellent judgment, like the contribution of Mr. Ichinomiya, manager of the Yokohama Specie Bank, entitled "Japan's Financial Stability." Dr. Sidney L. Gulick also writes with his accustomed poise and good sense. Other papers, like Mr. J. I. C. Clarke's "Mr. Rea and His Mission," are in questionable taste. Mr. Rea seems to have made a stupid blunder in confounding the dignified *Bomu Kaigi* (Imperial Defence Commission) with an imaginary *Kokumin-Gunji Kio Kai* (National Military Association), which the writer of "A Dream Story of War Between America and Japan" concocted, as a convenient pen name in publishing his squib. Mr. Rea treats the vagaries of this "Dream Story" seriously, as embodying the aims and ideals of the representative men of Japan; following in this the Hearst papers, which apparently seized on the publication in order to embitter relations between the two countries. Satire rather than heated epithet would have been the better weapon to use in exposing Mr. Rea's blunders.

UNDER the title "The Human Drift," with its hint of intentional paradox, six essays, one curtain-raiser, and one dramatic sketch of Jack London's are assembled from the various holders of the copyrights of earlier appearances into this final publication by the Macmillan Company ($1.25). The author's characteristic emphasis of mystery, with his insistence upon it as a healthful, rewarding aspect of human life, is seemingly the bond which connects these superficially varied pieces. For Jack London's mystery is compact as much of observation as of imagination, and is to be treated with robust, strenuous, even athletic attention. So alluvial deposits, the tale of the thermometer, the harvest of war, the high cost of living and the alleged law of Malthus, the peace crusade of Chancellor Jordan—all present themselves in the spirited medium of London's style with the ever-new fascination of the sea-serpent and the Wandering Jew and the Sorrows of Satan. The dramatic pieces are bits of the comedy of manners that skirt the reefs of disaster and folly by trusting to nature's kindly homing currents instead of to the conventional "big boat training." The fun is as breathless as the danger is real. Jack London sees both, faces both, and takes the reader into his expert confidence. And perhaps the reader's greatest pleasure is in the *curiosa felicitas* of the phrasing—London's way of taking things in heaven, and in earth, and in our philosophy, and then telling about them. Compare Prof. Spencer Trotter's "And population is drifting like the plankton out of which it has evolved, organizing through combinations of its units into manifold phases of activity and varieties of structural means, towards some end undoubtedly, but nevertheless drifting, not moving definitely from any collective sense of its own, with an end in view, but drifting in the vast ocean of the Infinite," with London's "The one drop of living, the one taste of being, has been good; and perhaps our greatest achievement will be that we dreamed immortality, even though we failed to realize it." Once again, there is much virtue in an if, particularly when writ large, as indeed Jack London, loyally following Henley and Stevenson, boldly writes it.

IT is with a sense of deep depression that any right-minded man, who is also instructed, sits down to read a new book on prostitution. Any one who has worked his way through a report of a Vice Commission or White Slave Traffic Commission knows about what he is in for; and he knows it will leave him with the old sensation that the world is all wrong and that society is travelling at a dizzy speed on a right of way that seems no more than the traditional two streaks of rust. Maude E. Miner, secretary of the New York Probation and Protective Association, now gives us "Slavery of Prostitution: A Plea for Emancipation" (Macmillan; $1.50). It is a plainly written, unsensational account, based upon the writer's experience. It gives a good body of facts about the identity of the unfortunates, the factors leading to prostitution, the legislation and enforcement of laws dealing with it, and discusses the various probationary, reformatory, and protective agencies that do or should exist. In the concluding "plea for emancipation," we are told that "we have not laid the blame where it belongs—upon ourselves. . . . We can find no excuse for our negligence. The indictment, uttered with splendid fervor by these young women, must stand against all of *us*. *We* must plead guilty to the charge. *We are to blame.*" Despite our feeling that a good deal is being put up to "us" by one reformer after another, engrossed as we are in our own pursuits—and legitimately, thoroughly, honestly, and even by force of necessity so engrossed—we are prone to beat upon the breast and cry "Peccavimus." But some of us do not blame ourselves so much for not having done what the present writer most wants us to do—excellent as her suggestions unqualifiedly are—as for not having made some movement towards action far more radical than anything proposed in this book. Perhaps the best comment one of us can make upon this sincere and high-minded publication is to specify that more radical action.

A YOUNG girl is struck down with a knife in the hand of a discarded suitor and dies. We send him to the electric chair, when we find it a clear case of murder in the first degree; and that is right. Society always has the right to rid itself of those who threaten its life by non-observance of one of the oldest provisions for social

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

conduct evolved through the experience of the ages. But now another young girl—a mere child in her teens—is ruined by the premeditated action of the procurer. For her own sake, she had better, in the majority of cases, be dead. From the standpoint of the interests of society, she had much better be dead. And what do we do to the destroyer of both body and soul? Imprison him a while; charge him certain dollars. "In Illinois, since 1908, pandering has been a misdemeanor punishable by a maximum penalty of one year and $500 fine." "Before the passage of a law in New York State in 1910, making it a felony for men to procure women and live on their earnings of prostitution, this crime was classed as 'vagrancy' and punished by a maximum sentence of six months in the workhouse or by a $10 fine—the same penalty that might be inflicted upon a vagrant who begged for 5 cents on the streets." Granted that it takes law some time to become adjusted to altered conditions of the environment, and that contemporary laws are more severe than older ones, what sense is there in this softness for this monstrous crime against the individual and the society? If any crime ever merited death, this one does. What is needed in this day of peril to society from its mongrel breeding, its sex disease, and vice, is some conception of what will happen to our children's children, to our nation and race, if drastic measures are rejected and effect is piled on effect. These are vital evils and they need strong remedies. Repairing the resultant ills at great expense of productive effort elsewhere is like putting court-plaster on a boil instead of lancing it and sterilizing the whole infected area. Severity of punishment for pandering should be viewed irrespective of its deterrent effect on individuals. It would probably deter, just as capital punishment for murder has deterred. But that is not the point. The point is that society should rid itself permanently of an element so degrading to its life as is the procurer.

DR. WILLIAM A. WHITE'S "Mechanisms of Character Formation, an Introduction to Psychoanalysis" (Macmillan; $1.75) treats of "the psychology which is called psychoanalysis and, no matter what the remote history of events preceding its birth, properly also bears the name of its real creator, Prof. Sigmund Freud, of Vienna—Freudian. This is a psychology which had its origin in trying to help sick people, in trying to alleviate their sufferings, and from the very first dealt with men and women in the raw, as they really were." The book is technical, and outlines a scheme which the author thinks should be taught in the medical schools and later become much more widely useful. If one is in sympathy with Freudian doctrine, one will doubtless be edified by what we have here; one will get some further ideas on *libido;* will learn, among other things, to interpret dreams, or, at least, to understand "dream mechanisms." But we have apprehended no real "message" in this book, either to the medical student or to the general reader; it seems to us to get nowhere in particular.

"THE Whale and the Grasshopper," by Seumas O'Brien (Little, Brown; $1.35), is a book of humorous philosophy as expressed in the whimsical dialogues and tales of two old Irish cronies, Micus Pat and Padna Dan. To their home-grown rustic wisdom they add a surprising knowledge of the world's affairs and problems. The opening dialogue, for example, with its parable of the whale and the grasshopper, provides lively comments on Socialism, feminism, racial character, philanthropy, war, and other large matters. "The world is a wonderful place when you come to think about it," says Padna Dan, "and Ireland is a wonderful place and so is America, and though there are lots of places like each other, there's no place like Ballysantamalo. When there's not sunshine there, there's moonshine, and the handsomest women in the world live there, and nowhere else except in Ireland or in the churchyards could you find such decent people."—"Decency," said Micus, "when you're poor is extravagance, and bad example when you're rich."—"And why?" said Padna.—"Well," said Micus, "because the poor imitate the rich and the rich give to the poor, and when the poor give to each other they have nothing of their own."—"That's communism you're talking," said Padna, "and that always comes before education and enlightenment. Sure, if the poor weren't decent they'd be rich, and if the rich were decent they'd be poor, and if every one had a conscience there'd be less millionaires."—"'Tis a poor bird that can't pick for himself."—"But suppose a bird had a broken wing and couldn't fly to where the pickings were?" said Micus.—"Well, then, bring the pickings to him. That would be charity."—"But charity is decency and wisdom is holding your tongue when you don't know what you're talking about." Thus amusingly if inconclusively our philosophizing pair, with the aid of their American-Irish creator, discourse of men and things: a book, on the whole, of fruitful pleasantry.

THE NATION

A WEEKLY JOURNAL

Published and owned by the
NEW YORK EVENING POST COMPANY

OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD, President
ALEXANDER DANA NOYES, Vice-President
JOHN PALMER GAVIT, Sec.
WILLIAM HAZEN, Treas.
EMIL M. SCHOLZ, Publisher.

Entered at the New York City Post Office as second-class mail matter

SUBSCRIPTION RATES.—Four dollars per annum, postpaid, in United States and Mexico; to Canada, $4.50, and to foreign countries comprised in the Postal Union, $5.00.

Address, THE NATION, 20 Vesey Street, Box 794, New York, Publication Office.

LONDON OFFICE: 16 Regent Street, S. W.
WASHINGTON OFFICE: Home Life Building
CHICAGO OFFICE: 332 South Michigan Avenue
BUENOS AIRES OFFICE: Lavalle 341

HAROLD DE WOLF FULLER, Editor

STANLEY WENT, Assistant Editor
PAUL ELMER MORE, Advisory Editor
WILLIAM G. PRESTON, Advertising Manager
R. B. McCLEAN, Business Manager

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Notes from the Capital

John Sharp Williams

NOT only in his handling of the country's affairs in the war crisis, but in his efforts to procure fair treatment for the great carrying companies, the President is likely to look for valuable backing from John Sharp Williams, of Mississippi, who, in the earlier part of his long Congressional career, made a specialty of the study of railway legislation. During a period when most of his associate supporters of Bryan were for tearing up everything corporate by the roots and throwing it into the scrap-heap, he was conspicuous for the moderation of his counsels. As a lifelong Democrat, he objected to Government ownership of railways, and viewed with suspicion such sweeping methods of control as vesting power in the Interstate Commerce Commission to fix rates for all the roads all the time; but he did advocate giving the Commission authority to change a particular rate in a particular case, if a complaint had been made of it and satisfactorily sustained on a full and fair hearing, the substitute rate to remain in force till set aside by the judgment of a competent Federal court. With railway wages, which are quite another thing from freight and passenger rates, he probably is less familiar; but in a matter where the two elements are as closely connected as in the plea of some of the railway managers that their companies will be financially crippled if required to increase their expenses at the dictation of the Brotherhoods and not permitted to recoup by extra charges for their service, his advice might prove valuable to a President who is taking a larger hand at legislation in its formative stages than any of his predecessors except Roosevelt.

Since entering the Senate, Williams has not been so much in the public eye as he was while in the House. As a Representative, he was the floor leader of a Democratic conglomeration whose lack of discipline, in comparison with its Republican antagonist, kept it for many years continually in the minority and hence in the opposition. This task brought out his strong points. He looks like a scholar—but a fiery one, if you pull him out of his intellectual browsing-place. His eyes, so deep-set that their overhanging brows are like hoods thrown out over window-casements, are bluish-gray in color, and as changeable in mood as a cat's: now gay and winsome, now full of snap and flash. His upper lip so hugs his thin and rather ragged moustache as to convey the impression of being sunken, and this effect is emphasized by a chin and jaw which, if not actually obtrusive, are at least in strong relief. His height is considerably less than his spareness of frame would lead one to think it, and the somewhat indolent motions of his body in action, coupled with a certain looseness of articulation in his speech, leave no doubt of the section of country from which he springs.

It would be hard to conceive a sharper contrast than exists between Williams and his colleague in the Senate. Vardaman is costumed and made up appropriately for his theatrical part; Williams is an every-day citizen, who might have been picked up from any group of neighbors gathered on an inn-porch in a country town to "talk politics." All the accessories bear out this idea. His clothes look as if they had been dropped upon him from the overturned hamper of some former owner who had given them hard wear. His gray hair would never be mistaken for a wig, because he has so obviously slept in it. His spectacles are so carelessly poised that they seem to hang on his nose rather than sit on it, and he has to change the position of his face as he alternately peers through or over their lenses. He is absent-minded to a degree, and Washington reeks with funny stories illustrative of it, and doubtless as nearly true as such yarns commonly are: as, for example, about his mechanically locking Mrs. Williams into their hotel room and carrying the key down to the office, and about his donning a new suit for some festal occasion, but forgetting the nether garments till reminded of their absence by his secretary. In view of all his peculiarities, it is only when he saunters into the thick of a debate and takes a few minutes to put a point to the latest speaker on the other side that you realize the how and why of his leadership. Not even his Southern drawl and word-clipping can distract your attention from the solid material he has wrapped up in them. What he has to say is said in the plainest terms and in the briefest form, and every word reaches its mark. The choice of phrases to express his meaning is as instinctive with him as breathing, and behind all their simplicity is a precision which you can better account for when you learn that after his academic course at the University of Virginia he took another at the University of Heidelberg.

Williams has pronounced the President "a good fellow." The President could well respond by calling him one of the last remaining "characters" in Congress—a body that once bristled with them.

TATTLER

Finance

The Two-Billion-Dollar Bond Issue

WILL the $2,000,000,000 bond issue of July 1, subscriptions to which will be received from now to June 15, be readily taken by American investors, or will it necessitate urgent pressure and upset the rest of the investment market? This was asked many times on Wall Street last week, when the announcement of the loan was followed by heavy Stock Exchange liquidation.

No such sum has ever been raised in this country in a single operation. Even the "billion-dollar Steel flotation" of 1901 consisted for the most part of the conversion of shares of half a dozen companies into the shares of one. Our Government has never, even during war time, raised more than two or three hundred millions in a two-month period.

Two questions were actually raised by last week's formal announcement of the $2,000,000,000 United States bond issue. They had to do with the success of the loan itself and with the effect of the subscription on the markets. The first question may be answered unhesitatingly. The loan will be quickly and completely successful. As to whether it will be a spectacular success, that depends partly on the manner and denominations, not yet announced, in which it will be issued, and very largely on the character of the canvass for subscribers.

It is too early to talk, as some of the newspapers have been talking, of a two-thousand-million loan being covered twice over by the applications. But the people are ready and able to take the amount prescribed. The offer addresses itself, as no other loan in nineteen years has done, to every

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

thrifty individual in the country. It creates, indeed, the first occasion since the later sixties, when the chance of acquiring United States Government bonds for individual investment pure and simple was the central inducement of the Government's proposal.

The present 3½ per cent. loan, with the accompanying pledge to advance the rate if other subsequent war loans are issued at more than 3½, appeals directly to the people, who are sure to take it. Large as the total offer is, it is no larger than the sum total invested last year in European war loans and returning American securities; and those investments of 1916 were in addition to the usual provision for new financing by our home corporations and the quite unprecedentedly large advances to neutral Governments and industries.

It is a matter of easy recollection that these large requisitions on American capital, during 1916, not only occasioned no extensive liquidation of stocks and bonds already on the market, but were accompanied by a prolonged and violent upward movement on the Stock Exchange. The question, therefore, as to what effect will be produced on those markets by the pending $2,000,000,000 loan may partly be judged by this very recent experience. The break in stocks last week can hardly be accepted as indicating exactly what the effect will be; for there were other and very different influences at work.

That prices would have acted as they did, if the statements at Washington, as to the war situation on land and sea, had been given out without the announcement of the loan, is quite conceivable. Most people have a general impression that these statements were purposely emphasized, with a primary view to convincing our people that a serious task and not a "holiday war" was before them. But the impression on the public mind was inevitably disquieting, and, whatever other good results have been attained, it was impossible that it should not have found reflection on the Stock Exchange.

Exactly how much displacement and depreciation of existing securities will occur, as a consequence purely of subscription to the war loan, will depend on two considerations. One is the extent to which the loan is eventually taken by individuals of moderate means or by prosperous business men who invest merely their accruing income. In so far as this is done, there will be no permanent burden on the money market through the tying-up of bank funds, and no necessary liquidation of older investment securities to raise cash for the loan subscription. The second consideration is the extent to which the banks employ with judgment the facilities of the Federal Reserve system.

Those facilities have thus far been hardly touched—as regards either power of increased note issue or power of sustaining individual banks' reserves through rediscount of their commercial paper holdings with the Federal Reserve banks. Even the $450,000,000 short-term Government notes lately taken by the banks (which, incidentally, are available like cash for subscription to the war loan) caused little recourse to the Reserve banks. Permanent financing by those institutions, with a view to putting through the present war loan, is not to be considered. But the use of the Federal Reserve machinery to steady the money market position and the credit situation, while the distribution of the bonds to the ultimate investor is in progress, should be a safeguard of high importance against serious disturbance of the markets.

The final consideration is, that the loans of our Government to its allies, which are to make up $3,000,000,000 out of the total $5,000,000,000 authorized war credit, will cover sales by our manufacturers and producers to Europe. The profits from that immense production, and the enormous export trade which has arisen from it in the past two years, will continue.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK

FICTION

Austin, M. The Ford. Houghton Mifflin. $1.50 net.
Brady, C. T. When the Sun Stood Still. Revell. $1.35 net.
Comstock, H. T. The Man Thou Gavest. Doubleday, Page. $1.35 net.
Cooke, M. B. Cinderella Jane. Doubleday, Page.
Hendryx, J. B. The Gun Brand. Putnam. $1.50 net.
London, J. Jerry. Macmillan. $1.50 net.
Maher, R. A. Gold Must Be Tried by Fire. Macmillan. $1.50 net.
Oemler, M. C. Slippy McGee. Century. $1.35 net.
Richmond, G. S. The Brown Study. Doubleday, Page. $1.25 net.
"Rita." The Rubbish Heap. Putnam. $1.40 net.
Skinner, C. Good-Morning, Rosamond! Doubleday, Page. $1.35 net.
"Taffrail." Pincher Martin, O.D. Houghton Mifflin. $1.50 net.
Wherry, E. The Wanderer on a Thousand Hills. Lane. $1.40 net.

MISCELLANEOUS

Abbott, G. The Immigrant and the Community. Century. $1.50 net.
Bjerre, P. The History and Practice of Psycho-Analysis. Translated by E. N. Barrow. Badger. $3 net.
Bourne, R. Education and Living. Century. $1.25 net.
Chapman, J. C., and Rush, G. P. The Scientific Measurement of Classroom Products. Silver, Burdett & Co.
Crawford, A. W. Hamlet, an Ideal Prince. Badger. $1.50 net.
Ferenczi, S. Contributions to Psycho-Analysis. Translated by E. Jones. Badger. $3 net.
Fisher, L. A. The Mystic Vision in the Grail Legend and in the Divine Comedy. Columbia University Press. $1.50 net.
Gibbs, P. The Battles of the Somme. London: W. Heinemann. 6s. net.
Hamilton, G. Parliamentary Reminiscences and Reflections, 1868-1885. Dutton. $4 net.
Journal of the National Institute of Social Sciences. Vol. III—January, 1917. Boston Book Co.
Letters from a French Hospital. Houghton Mifflin. $1 net.
Major, C. T. How to Develop Your Personality. Crowell. $1 net.
Moore, E. Studies in Dante. Fourth series. Oxford University Press.
Morgan, J. M. Recollections of a Rebel Reefer. Houghton Mifflin. $3 net.
Oxford University Handbook, 1917. Oxford University Press.
Powell, C. L. English Domestic Relations. 1487-1653. Columbia University Press. $1.50 net.
Sizer, J. P. The Commercialization of Leisure. Badger. 75 cents.
Symons, A. Figures of Several Centuries. Dutton. $3 net.

RELIGION AND PHILOSOPHY

Dresser, H. W. Handbook of the New Thought. Putnam. $1.25 net.
Wilson, H. B. Does Christ Still Heal? Dutton. $1 net.

DRAMA AND MUSIC

Cooley, J. The Dance of Youth. Sherman, French. $1.25 net.
Sheridan, R. B. The School for Scandal. Collated and edited by H. H. Webster. Houghton Mifflin. 55 cents net.

ART

Berenson, B. The Study and Criticism of Italian Art. Third Series. Macmillan. $3.25 each.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Byne, A., and Stapley, M. Spanish Architecture of the Sixteenth Century. Putnam. $7.50 net.

Rolfe, A. L. Interior Decoration for the Small Home. Macmillan. $1.25 net.

SHAKESPEARE'S WORKMANSHIP

By SIR ARTHUR QUILLER-COUCH

Professor of English Literature, University of Cambridge. Just ready. $2.00 net

"These are familiar discourses rather than learned enquiries. . . . They seek to discover, in some of his plays, just what Shakespeare was trying to do as a playwright."—*From the Preface.*

HENRY HOLT & COMPANY 19 West 44th Street New York

ON CAUSATION, WITH A CHAPTER ON BELIEF

By CHARLES A. MERCIER, M.D., F.R.C.P., F.R.C.S., Author of "Criminal Responsibility," etc. 8vo, $1.40 *net.*

Dr. Mercier thinks that it is time "to take the matter of causation out of the hands of logicians and investigate it by the light of common-sense." He has dealt with the subject upon somewhat novel lines. The volume is clearly written and noteworthy for its common-sense and practical suggestiveness. Stress is laid upon the importance of a knowledge of the nature of causation in such matters as the law of evidence and the determination of the causes of death and insanity.

LONGMANS, GREEN & CO., Publishers
FOURTH AVE. AND 30TH ST., NEW YORK.

RUDYARD KIPLING

AFTER SEVEN YEARS HAS COMPLETED A NEW BOOK OF SHORT STORIES ENTITLED

"A DIVERSITY OF CREATURES"

FOURTEEN STORIES FOURTEEN NEW POEMS

TO READ THEM IS TO RENEW THE MAGIC OF MANY OF THE GREAT KIPLING CREATIONS OF THE PAST TWENTY-FIVE YEARS WITH A NEW UNDERTONE OF THE WORLD WAR BREAKING FORTH IN AT LEAST TWO STORIES OF THE HIGHEST GENIUS.

Green Cloth, Net, $1.50. Red Limp Leather, Net, $1.75

OTHER BOOKS BY KIPLING

Puck of Pook's Hill.
Traffics and Discoveries.
The Five Nations.
Just So Stories.
Kim.
The Day's Work.
Stalky & Co.
Plain Tales from the Hills.
Life's Handicap.
Under the Deodars.
Songs from Books.
The Kipling Birthday Book.
The Light that Failed.
Soldier Stories.
The Naulahka.
Departmental Ditties.
Soldiers Three.
Many Inventions.
From Sea to Sea.
The Seven Seas.
Actions and Reactions.
Rewards and Fairies.
Red leather, each, net, $1.75.

Published by THE CENTURY COMPANY
(Uniform with this Edition)

The Jungle Book.
Captains Courageous.
The Second Jungle Book.

PUBLISHED BY DOUBLEDAY, PAGE & CO., GARDEN CITY, N. Y.

Rupture Need Not Keep You From Your Favorite Sport

DOES your rupture bar you from the exercise which you used to enjoy when physically sound?

There is a way by which you can enjoy the sports now denied you. It will be found in the **Brooks Rupture Appliance.** Many a ruptured person, with this aid, is following practically all of the pursuits of an entirely well individual.

Because the **Brooks Rupture Appliance** is made to the individual measure of the wearer, it fits perfectly. Because it fits perfectly it gives complete support to the injured portions, permitting one to enjoy any exercise not too violent. Because of its soft pneumatic cushion, it adheres to the flesh and slipping is impossible.

Ordered by War Department

The **Brooks Rupture Appliance** has been ordered for the past nine years by the United States Department of War. The Surgeon-General in referring to the Appliance states that the Examining Surgeons have "certified in each case that the Appliance was satisfactory." Hundreds of **Brooks Rupture Appliances** have been sold to the War Department, but never has one been returned to us as unsatisfactory.

It will be very easy for you to obtain one of these appliances on *free trial* to test its worth. If you are not entirely satisfied with it your money will be cheerfully refunded. And the price you will find to be remarkably low. Remember, we are a sanitarium, not a factory.

Use the coupon. Use it now.

BROOKS APPLIANCE COMPANY
Manufacturers of Orthopedical Appliances
491 State Street Marshall, Mich., U. S. A.

I should like to receive, in a plain wrapper and without obligating myself in any way, full details concerning the **Brooks Rupture Appliance.**

Name _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____

WOMEN AND WORK

By HELEN MARIE BENNETT

Miss Bennett has been finding jobs for college girls for seven years, and in this new book she discusses in an individual and philosophical style the relation of the college girl to her vocation. In view of the tendency to criticise the college girl in business, it has an important message, both for the critics and the criticised. *At all booksellers.* $1.50 *net*

THIS IS AN APPLETON BOOK
D APPLETON & Co. PUBLISHERS, N. Y.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Lists of Publications in sciences, philosophy, philology, history, economics, will be sent upon request.

The University of California Press
BERKELEY, CAL.

Misinforming a Nation

A critical examination of the Encyclopaedia Britannica

By Willard Huntington Wright

All bookstores, $1.25 net

Published by B. W. HUEBSCH, New York

RECOLLECTIONS OF A REBEL REEFER

By Colonel JAMES MURRAY MORGAN

A stirring book of reminiscences by a blockade runner, soldier of fortune, and diplomatist, who roamed the world over in search of adventure.

Illustrated. $3.00 net.

HOUGHTON MIFFLIN CO.

VONDEL'S LUCIFER Second Edition

Van Noppen's Translation, Illustrated

Influenced Milton, 458 pp. Postpaid, **$2.00**

CHAS. I. VAN NOPPEN, Publisher, Greensboro, N.C.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Summary of the News

A CERTAIN tendency towards panic, rapidly overcome and converted into a wholesome realization of the seriousness of the nation's task, was observable in Washington last week, and thence spread through the country. Two causes contributed to the state of mind: First, reports from Washington of the insistence by members of the French and British missions on the need for American troops at the front as soon as they can be got ready; secondly, the increased toll of shipping taken by submarines of the enemy.

THE question of sending a small force to France in the immediate future is still under debate, and there is no certainty as to the views entertained by the authorities in Washington, except that the General Staff is said, on general principles, to be opposed to it. Last week's rather sensational reports as to the attitude of the French and British Missions may probably be boiled down to this: that Marshal Joffre approves, even urges, the plan, and that his views are endorsed by the British Mission. The tone of some Washington dispatches would appear unwittingly to have done a certain injustice in representing the views of the two Missions, the members of which have adhered scrupulously to their expressed purpose of informing rather than recommending. The question of the immediate dispatch of troops, it is felt, really hinges on whether the tonnage can be spared for their transport. It was announced on Monday, however, that nine regiments of engineers would go forward for railway work along the lines of communication at the "earliest possible moment." Details of Col. Roosevelt's volunteer scheme were published in Monday's papers.

STATEMENTS as to the situation produced by increased activity of German submarines have been various and sensational. Secretary Lane's statement on May 2 that 400,000 tons of shipping had been destroyed in the past week was afterwards admitted to have been exaggerated, and possibly Admiral Lord Beresford's characterization of recent losses as "appalling" gave a more alarmist impression than was necessary. The situation is, however, sufficiently disquieting, even though Lord Northcliffe and Lord Curzon both assured us last week that the U-boat campaign was bound to fail. Of that few people entertain any doubts. The point which is emphasized by recent returns is that every day that it succeeds the more serious becomes the question of supplies for our allies. The British official announcement for the week ended April 29 showed that thirty-eight merchant vessels of more and thirteen of less than 1,600 tons were sunk. Arrivals of all nationalities of over 100 tons were 2,716; sailings, 2,690.

INCLUDED in recent losses by U-boats have been two British transports, the Ballarat, carrying Australian troops, all of whom were saved, and the Arcadian, from which 277 officers and men and two civilians were lost. The American steamship Rockingham was torpedoed on May 1, two lives being lost. Twenty-three men all told, including the officer commanding and some members of the naval gun crew, were lost as a result of the torpedoing of the American tanker Vacuum on April 28.

TRANSFERENCE of the Government from a peace to a war body appears to be proceeding satisfactorily. An exception to that statement must be made in the case of the Espionage bill, the objectionable clause in which was rushed through the House in a slightly changed form on Friday of last week, after it had been decisively defeated and many members had departed thinking the matter at an end. It is hoped that the emendations which should have been made by the House will now be undertaken by the Senate. An important section of the bill, on which the Administration is insistent, but which has aroused hot debate in the Senate, is that conferring powers on the President to declare an embargo on American exports to neutral countries contiguous to Germany.

THE Draft bill is still in the stage of conference; meanwhile all preparations are made for the application of the measure within a short time after it shall have become law. The "Liberty Loan" of $2,000,000,000 was offered for subscription last week, and will remain open until June 15. Present indications are that the loan will be largely over-subscribed. Loans of $100,000,000 have been made to Italy and to France. The fiscal agency for the various loans to the Allies, it is understood, will be taken over by the Government itself. Plans in connection with the project of building the new wooden ships appear to be proceeding smoothly, the enrolment of 15,000 skilled shipbuilders having been announced. Some of the confiscated German ships are said to be already fit for use, and the entire fleet will be in operation within the next five months. A drastic bill was recommended to the House Agriculture Committee on May 3 giving the President absolute authority to regulate the production, distribution, and prices of food and other necessities during the war. Canada is expected to coöperate with the United States in food regulations.

NEW YORK this week extends an official welcome to both the French and the British Missions. Last week, while M. Viviani and Marshal Joffre were receiving enthusiastic greetings in Chicago and the Middle West, the House of Representatives, for the first time in its history, was listening to and warmly applauding an address by a British statesman, Mr. Balfour, the President of the United States being an interested auditor in the Executive Gallery. Earlier in the week M. Viviani and Marshal Joffre had similarly been the guests of the Senate and of the House. The personnel of the British Mission was augmented by the arrival on Friday of last week of a Committee on Labor and Munitions. A formal conference was held last Saturday of officials of the War Department and members of the British Mission.

MUCH has been heard from Germany in the past ten days of internal reform and possible terms of peace, but the world at large seems to display a tendency to regard these reports as Greek gifts, an expression to which the Kaiser's brother-in-law has given renewed significance. From reports which have leaked through the censorship, or which the censorship has allowed to escape, it would appear that the Chancellor is again the storm-centre. His expected and much-advertised address on Germany's terms of peace has been postponed from occasion to occasion, while the Pan-Germans and Conservatives roar openly for annexation and disavowal of the Socialists, and the Constitution Committee of the Reichstag adopts solemn resolutions proposing to restrict the authority of the Emperor and make the Chancellor responsible to Parliament.

RUSSIA passed through an acute crisis last week, and one may hope that the Government has successfully surmounted it. The trouble seems to have come as an aftermath of the celebrations of May Day, when bombs were thrown in Petrograd and a general killed. The incident was severely reprobated by the Executive Committee of the Workmen's and Soldiers' Delegates, but the general excitement led to street riots and parades, in which the resignation of the Provisional Government, and particularly of Foreign Minister Milyukov, was demanded. The ostensible reason for the demand was the note sent on May 1 to the Allied Governments assuring them that the revolution would afford no pretext for any slackening on the part of Russia in the common struggle. The grievance was that the Committee of Workmen's and Soldiers' Delegates had not been consulted in the matter of the note, and they professed to fear that the Government in sending it had committed the country to a blindfold prosecution of the war not in accordance with the non-aggressive aims of the new social order. The Government took a firm stand, declaring that it would resign rather than recall the note, and Professor Milyukov courageously harangued the demonstrators, apparently persuading them to his view. Subsequently the Council of Workmen's and Soldiers' Delegates adopted a vote of confidence in the Government by a small majority, and it was announced that the Duma would be convoked in extraordinary session immediately.

NO let-up is observable in the British and French offensives on the west front, although intensified German resistance has made progress slower. East and southeast of Arras the British, on May 3, launched a fourth powerful blow against the Hindenburg line west of Créant, capturing a number of strong positions. From some of these they were later driven back, but by Monday they had regained ground lost in the German counter-attack and had again reached Bullecourt. The French commenced an attack on the front north of the Aisne River on May 5, and were successful in clearing of the enemy all but a small section of the Chemin des Dames, the twenty-mile high road running along the ridge north of the river. Several new German divisions were thrown into the counter-attack, but all the ground gained was held, the French capturing in the two days' battle more than 6,000 prisoners. In Mesopotamia Gen. Maude, under date of May 2, reported a victory over the Thirteenth Turkish Army Corps on both banks of the Shatt-el-Adham, the Turks being pursued into the Jebel Hamrin hills.

MR. LLOYD GEORGE'S statement on the Home Rule question has again been postponed until this week. Mr. Bonar Law, Chancellor of the Exchequer, introduced the budget into the House of Commons on May 2. It carries in total estimates £2,290,381,000. A remarkable feature of Britain's financing of the war, which was emphasized by the Chancellor, is the fact that 26 per cent. of the whole expenditure is paid out of revenue.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED